

12. Relocation and Reallocation of Land

12.1 Land-to-Land Compensation Scheme

The proposed Nyarupakwe Pilot Project will have to cause several adverse effects on different subgroups of the survey area. The most significant adverse effect is the inundation of farming area followed by the land exchanged for irrigation area development.

The social survey facilitated discussions on how the villages could deal with the people affected by creation of the dam and irrigation development area. The following proposed measures are general statements of intent that need to be revisited and elaborated. When the project is implemented, actual committee action will be taken as such committee is established. It was proposed that households in the villages affected by the project would be dealt with in one of the following ways:

- They will have to be given first priority in the allocation of irrigation plots; or
- If they are not interested in irrigation plot, they will either be allocated dry land plots from land holdings belonging to households that would have opted to get into the irrigation or they will be resettled elsewhere under the Government resettlement program.

12.2 Voluntary Resettlement

For the benefit of entire community, 84% of the respondents indicated there they are willing to move to give way to the pilot project. However, the story is different for Sekema village where almost 40% of the respondents were not willing to move out of their current settlements if the reservoir inundated their homestead. Incidentally, based on the survey on the land owners whose farming areas are inundated, there are two separate farming areas subject to inundation. Both of the farming area owners have stated that they are willing to move out.

Reasons for the willingness or unwillingness to move vary across subgroups. For Muza and Makarichi village, both of which are affected by the reservoir, the majority of the villagers were willing to move provided there is room for compensation. The second major reason was coming from the sense of social responsibility as they recognize that the pilot project is good for the entire community. Other reasons include fear of floods and other dangers associated with the dam as well as an awareness of the potential economic benefits from the project.

In the case of Hlamba and Magonyo, where the irrigation development takes place, answers are essentially the same as those of in Muza and Makarichi. They tried to solve the replacement of the farming areas affected by the 60 ha of irrigation development area within the village. Without a help offered from Gokwe South District Administration, the villagers suggested to spare their grazing area for compensation of the farming area subject to development of irrigation scheme.

Where necessary, land owners of large farming area, part of which is not used for a long period of time will make his land available for compensation on the terms of exchange with irrigation plot, or voluntary offer of such land.

The following households in the Survey Area - A (Muza, Sekema and Makarichi villages) will have part or all of their fields flooded by the proposed Nyarupakwe dam. In total, 19 households will lose entire or a portion of their farming areas.

Land Owners Affected by the Reservoir

Kraal	Name of farmer
Muza	Mapurisa
	Owen
	Patrick Chirairo
	Sinoia
	Henry Gumbo
	Norbert Jakazi
	Titus Chitembetembe
	Ben Mutema
	Magombedze
	Nyasha Muza
Tawanda Muza	
Makarichi	Mr Mafuta
	Mr Pote
	Mr Chidhakwa Sur
	Isaac Mugoni
	Mbudaya Makarichi
Mr Mafa	
Sekema	Mr Mlotshwa
	Mrs Dhambuza

In the Subgroup 3 (Magonyo and Hlamba villages) the farmers in the table below will lose their fields to the proposed irrigation development area. In total, 15 households will have to give up their land for irrigation area development. If they prefer rain-fed farming, they will be given land in the area of their preference or they will be given irrigation plot as they so desire.

Land Owners Affected by Irrigation Area Development

Kraal	Name of farmer
Hlamba	Peter Katanda
	MacKenzie Dube
	George Tume
	Jeffery Dube
	Muchineripi
	G Makanyisa
Magonyo	Clever Muyambi
	Kumalo
	Manase Munengiwa
	Masola
	Edward Sithole
	Maushe
	Chihota Mutandwa
Peter Mutandwa	
Taveni	

12.3 Characteristics of the Households Subject to Resettlement

12.3.1 Key Informant Survey

Based on the findings of the key informant interviews carried out with the villagers who are going to lose their land or part of it to the irrigation project. The fieldwork exercise was aimed at obtaining feelings and views of the affected households. The households covered in the survey were from the following villages tabulated in the table below.

Village	No. of Interviewed Household	Percentage
1 Reservoir Area		
1) Muza	4	30.8
2) Makarichi	1	7.6
3) Sekema	2	15.4
2 Irrigation Area		
1) Hlamba	3	23.1
2) Magonyo	3	23.1
Total	13	100.0

12.3.2 Size of Household and Land Holding

The average size of household of the affected villages is 6.9 while the average size of land holding is 3.5 ha as is shown in the following table. This implies that there are a large size of families with small size of land holding subject to resettlement.

	Mean	Max.	Min.
Household	6.89	13.00	2.0
Land Holding	3.54	20.00	1.50

12.3.3 Current Crop Production by the Affected Households

The affected households grow cotton and maize. As is shown in the following table, the average amount of cotton they grow is 9 bales (50kg/bale) whilst maize, they harvested 52 bags (50kg/bag) for feeding the family that may last for the season.

Type of Crop	Mean	Range	Min.	Max.
Cotton bales	8.67	10.00	6.00	16.00
Maize	52.00	82.00	8.00	90.00

12.3.4 Feelings of villagers about the proposed dam irrigation project

The majority of the villagers subject to resettlement felt the project was a positive one as it is going to provide them with water throughout the year. They all agreed that the proposed irrigation project will double their income earnings from agriculture. They were also hopeful that the irrigation would create employment at least during the construction period for the unemployed youth in the ward that will now work on the fields. However not all villagers interviewed had positive feelings about the

project as 27 percent of them felt that Gokwe is a cotton growing region and as such irrigation was of no use. The villagers further argued that they would lose their farming land and start their agricultural activities from the scratch.

Half of the villagers interviewed said they wanted plots in the proposed irrigation scheme area. They want to grow vegetables for sale in these plots, which will enable them to earn income all the time. The other villagers, 38 percent, said in addition to plots in the irrigation scheme they wanted pieces of land for rain-fed farming. In other words they want dry-land of a similar condition as they grow their cotton at the moment. Thereby they can grow cotton, which is a major source of income in the village. However a few of the farmers, about 8 percent, said they wanted compensation in monetary terms for the loss of their land and infrastructure development they had done over the past years.

12.3.5 Resettlement

Asked on where they want to resettle after losing their land to the Pilot Project the majority of the households interviewed felt they should be resettled within their villages through subdivision of land from other large land owner farmers whose land will not be affected. Other respondents, 31 percent said they would be prepared to be resettled even outside their villages. Those who mentioned that they want to resettle outside their village is generally small land owners and they are in the hope that they are given 5 ha of land and reestablish themselves.

Target Area of Resettlement

Area where they want to resettled	Count	Percentage
1. Within the village	8	61.5
2. Outside the village	4	30.8
3. Outside the ward	1	7.7
Total	13	100.0

Overall, the majority of the farmers interviewed had positive views or attitude about the proposed dam and irrigation project as most of them are willing to move and all are optimistic that the project will improve their livelihoods. However only a few farmers were pessimistic about the project as they felt cotton growing as opposed to irrigation farming was the solution for the ward.

12.4 Increase of Malaria

The establishment of the irrigation development area is expected to increase incidents of malaria and water borne diseases such as diarrhea in the project area. This is expected to be more marked in Survey Area - A and 3; the areas in the vicinity of the reservoir and the canal. Malaria is already a very big problem in the pilot project area. As such the local residents in the pilot project area demand that the proposed project should include measures to mitigate against an increase of these diseases.

12.5 Increase of Wildlife

Establishment of the dam may attract the project area of wild animals that could harm people and/destroy their crops, livestock and property. Such animals could be crocodiles, hippopotamus and birds and ducks. The Survey Area - A households will be affected most compared to all other subgroups in the pilot project area.

During the construction of the dam wildlife dependent and relying on water flowing in the Nyarupakwe River will be denied access to the water as it is impounded all for dam construction. It may just not be possible to allow the water to flow downstream during construction period because of the construction method that will be employed. The pilot residents of the pilot project area demands that a construction method that minimizes loss of aquatic life downstream of the river be employed to construct the propose Nyarupakwe dam.

12.6 Increase of Various Risks and Inconveniences

The residents of the pilot project area expects the dam, which is to increase exposure of them to risks of drowning as river is impounded. The residents of the pilot project area, therefore, demands measures that protect the community from this threatening risks.

The road from Gokwe to Nyarupakwe business center will be moved downstream of its current position because the proposed dam will flood its present location. This increases walking distances to and from the business center for the people project area.

Usually, construction works of the proposed pilot project may introduce a relatively large labour force that is brought from communities that have alien values and culture to that of the pilot project area. These may disrupt the social harmony existing in the project area today. The labour force may also come in with new diseases and behavior that could threaten to destroy the pilot project area's social cohesion. Thus, the residents of the pilot project area recommends employment of the local people for skilled and unskilled work to limit these possible negative impacts.

Despite the fact that recognizing the possible negative impacts associated with the implementation of the pilot project, the local residents still believe that the proposed pilot project is generally considered a good opportunity to bring a form of economic development. On the other hand, some see the pilot project going a long way to ensure improvement of their livelihoods in a sustainable manner except for which there are some directly benefited.

13. Presentation of the Outline of the Pilot Project

Based on the identified needs and demands during the Stage I Survey, outline of the project was presented to the local residents during the public hearing as a major part

of Stage II Survey: Presentation of the Outline of the Project Based on the Local Needs and Demands. The following is the suggested outline of the pilot project:

- Construction of medium scale dam;
- Development of irrigation area;
- Construction of small scale dam for a dual function of silt-trap and water storage for livestock;
- Rehabilitation of 24 km short-cut road linking to Gokwe; and
- Rehabilitation of the existing borehole.

14. Response of the Community

During the Stage II Survey public hearing, held in Nyarupakwe Business Center on 16th March, 270 people from 12 villages attended. These villages are in the Survey Area - A & B as well as other areas in the downstream area of Nyarupakwe River. Based on the suggested project outline, the following is a list of summarized and broadly generalized initial responses:

(a) Beneficial Effect

- Water for livestock is maintained throughout the year;
- Increased farming activities for cash income;
- The scheme allows us to obtain sufficient food during dry season;
- Allows us to do fish farming as well as vegetable gardening;
- Improves our standard of living;
- Enable us to plant fruit trees;
- It could increase employment opportunities;
- Fish farming in the reservoir will provide animal protein food;
- Water for domestic use may increase;
- Dairy industry will become possible to promote;
- Piped water to near-by school will be constructed; and
- Cattle fattening, dairy cattle keeping and dip tank maintenance will become easy.

(b) Adverse Effect

- Since we do not have sufficient land for our children, land exchange in the irrigation area may become a difficult part of the pilot project;
- Farming area, at the same time it becomes dry season grazing area, is lost;
- If the dam gives in during the high rainfall, downstream area is damaged;
- Water canal passes through homestead and subdivide the area;
- Fragmentation of the farming area may cause land owners suffer from reduced farming area;
- Increase of Malaria is very likely because of breeding area for mosquito is increased; and
- Children and livestock may drawn in the reservoir.

(c) Other Request

- We would like to engage in dairy industry;
- Piped water to individual household;
- Electrification of each household;
- The reservoir and the near-by hills should be developed as tourism/recreational area;
- Water canal passing through the village should be made available for community and primary school's vegetable gardening and orchard;
- Those who give up land for irrigation area should be given priority to obtain irrigation plot;
- Those who give up land but do not take up irrigation plot should exchange land with those who is willing to do so;
- Those who lose farming area to the reservoir should be encouraged to voluntary relocation; and
- Irrigation area should be developed in the area near dam.

15. Visitation to Ngondoma Irrigation Area

Among the project outline presented during the Stage II Survey's public hearing, irrigation scheme was a totally new scheme of agricultural technology. Thus, it was considered beneficial to visit any successful irrigation area and learn from it. For this purpose, Ngondoma Irrigation Area in Empress Mine, Zhombe District, Midland Province.

Ngondoma irrigation scheme was established in 1968 using water discharged from Empress Mine's dam. It started out with 22 ha of irrigation area and each plot was 1 ha or more. Because there was no knowledge of how beneficial it would become, a large number of local residents did not show their interest on the scheme. However, as it came to know among the local farmers that the scheme brought large profit, there was harsh complaints on the management of the irrigation scheme.

It was this event that Ngondoma Irrigation Area was expanded to present size of 44 ha and each plot is subdivided into 0.1 ha. So as to make a large number of villagers become beneficiaries. Over the years, some gave up irrigation plots and these are taken over by others. As a result, present land allocation varies from 0.1 ha to 0.9 ha depending on the level of ability of each farmer in terms of management of the irrigation area as well as their own rain-fed farming areas and cattle rearing.

16. Presentation of the Final Details of Pilot Project for Stage III Survey

Public hearing for the Stage III Survey was held in Nyarupakwe Business Center on 14th April, 2000. Attendance was 191 from 13 villages. There was no attendance from Komboni, Mahbarani and Mahvondo that are within the survey area. There were some villagers from Njini that it is outside of the survey area.

General session for explanations of the detailed project components followed by questions and answer session was held during the first half of the meeting. Among others, water use of irrigation canal in terms of its administration during the night and day was explained. Other aspect of irrigation management were also explained as these were new to the local residents. The meeting was then sub-divided into three groups as follows:

- Group 1: Management of the Project;
- Group 2: Land Allocation of the Irrigation Area
- Group 3: History of Infrastructure Development in the Project Area

Each group discussed on the issue of the most effective way of the implementation of pilot project from their point of view. ITDG's survey team recorded the contents of discussion. Result of each group discussion was then disclosed as the attendance reassembled for the closing session.

17. Developing the Sense of Participation

17.1 Community Participation to the Pilot Project Design

Participatory development is defined in this survey as a process that effectively mobilize the local residents as potential beneficiaries. By organizing them and building their capacity to manage their psychological development of participation in a sustainable manner, the project is so designed to be successful. Not only are the beneficiaries the true architects of the goals and objectives of their development, they are also the developers and implementers of strategies for achieving the objectives. Evaluation and making the necessary adjustment along the way of survey, therefore the input to the project design become rich in the information that the local residents appreciate it in the end. Implied in this definition are the following principles:

- Development of a shared vision and strategy for achieving it by the beneficiaries.
- Establishment of mechanisms for coordinating participation and contributions of all stakeholders in the defined development unit.
- Establishment, nurturing and maintaining the development process management capacity of the primary development beneficiaries.
- Attainment of the set objectives and enhancement of beneficiaries' livelihoods (increased incomes)

It is within this context that the Nyarupakwe participatory development facilitation strategy is proposed. It starts with the pilot project community mobilization, proceeds to the establishment of the pilot community organization to manage the pilot project and it enters the stage of developing the capacity of the pilot community organization to effectively discharge its duties and maintain itself.

17.2 Mobilization of the Community

In general, mobilization of the local population within the survey area aims to raise awareness of all subgroups as defined during the survey period. In particular the local residents directly concerned with the pilot project are so informed to come together and take responsibility for the development of their common future. By addressing their common problems using their common natural resources, explicit project components are formulated within the process.

Mobilization of the local population builds on the social survey activities and findings by drawing on the identified community problems and needs. These are packaged and communicated in a manner that is sensitive to the community's literacy levels and using communication symbols familiar to the community. Mobilization of the local population within the survey area for the pilot project is therefore depends much on a two-way process of receiving the information from the survey team and return it with their comments.

For this purpose, public hearing meeting was used as a tool for awareness raising and it was complimented by formal and informal discussions that took place within the survey area as the key local residents were interviewed for detailed information gathering. These include people such as Munyati cooperative manager, village heads, school headmasters and extension officers of the government department. All public hearing meetings were held at locations and times that are sensitive to community's workload and work schedule. Thus Thursday morning of 09:00hrs - 13:00hrs have proved to be the best time for public hearing meetings. As is expressed in the next three sections, public hearing including PRA exercise has been the most useful tool for mobilization of the local population. Hence community participation to the project design was considered very achieved within the framework of the pilot project.

18. Legal Framework

18.1 Setting-up the Local Community Institution

The Water Act of 1976 was replaced by the Water Act of 1998. The underlying objectives of water reform in Zimbabwe in the past have been four-fold:-

- Redressing past injustices in water access to the benefit of historically disadvantaged small-holder farmers and emerging indigenous commercial farmers without prejudicing existing individual large scale commercial and estate concerns.
- Financial devolution of responsibilities from the state to the user domain.
- Decentralization of operation and management of water allocation by involving user organizations.
- Formulation of a legal framework that befits present day societal norms on what is just and fair and what is practically feasible.

The essential features of the Water Act of 1998 whose include:

- The vesting of all water in the President.
- Removing the concept of water rights issued in perpetuity and attached to the land in respect of which they are granted. In place of this has been introduced a permit system under which permits for the use of water will be valid for a specified period of time and will be subject to review as circumstances may demand.
- The removal of much of the differentiation in approach to the management of surface water and ground water.
- The removal of the preferential rights to water currently held by riparian owners.
- The conferring on catchment councils set up to manage the use of water, the power to issue the permits required for certain uses of water thus decentralizing and removing this function from the Administrative Court to which appeals will now be made in certain circumstances.
- Ensuring that catchment councils set up to manage river systems in their catchment areas are representative of all water users in the area concerned, the intention being that people in Communal and Resettlement areas be involved in water management.
- Introducing the Zimbabwe National Water Authority as a tool of Government in performing certain functions hitherto the responsibility of the Secretary through the Department of Water Development.
- Extending beyond irrigation to other commercial purposes, the purpose for which combined water schemes may be established.

The Water Act of 1998 also introduces application fees for permits to use water. For the commercial use of water, the charge will be used for the development of water resources. There will be charges for the permission to discharge any effluent into streams or water bodies and the revenue will be channeled into matters relating to water quality control. Economic penalties will be introduced in respect of contravention of the Act. Where an order prohibiting a person from doing something has been made, the order will stand despite the fact that an appeal may have been noted against the order.

The points of contention in water reform in Zimbabwe has been on the ownership and user rights, principles of water allocations, equity and sustainability. The Water Act of 1998 did away with the priority date system which embraced the principle of 'first in time first in right' principle as this was regarded as discriminatory against the black population.

Another new Act, the Zimbabwe National Water Authority (ZINWA) Act of 1999 gives power to catchment councils to issue water permits in consultation with ZINWA, a function which was centrally being done by the Water Court.

18.2 Other Relevant Legislation

18.2.1 The Natural Resources Management Act

This act contains a number of constraints on natural resources management and specific regulation on how far close from the stream soil excavation or cultivation can be reasonably safely carried out without erosion and siltation. Exploitation of soil should be done at a distance of at least 30 m from the stream bank. The Act also provides for the proclamation of over-exploited areas in terms of degradation as conservation areas.

The Nyarupakwe Pilot project would therefore need to ensure that the plots for cultivation or gardening are at least 30 m away from the reservoir.

18.2.2 The Forestry Act

The Forestry Act is established by the Forestry Commission. It is mainly concerned with curbing deforestation by protecting the natural vegetation and biodiversity through indiscriminate exploitation (cutting down trees, burning vegetation). The Act also regulates cultivation on the river banks but it sets limits at about 100 m.

In the case of the Pilot Project, grazing management scheme that is planned to take place within the villages of Hlamba, Magonyo, and Murandu on the left bank of Nyarupakwe river and Jeffrey on the right bank are subject to restriction of the forestry act.

18.2.3 The Rural District Councils Act

The Rural District Councils Act which stipulates that the management and control of defined areas is vested within the Rural District Council which issues license for the exploitation of any resources within its jurisdiction. However, when it comes to timber resources, full control will come under the Forestry Commission. The Rural District Council, as the planning authority of the Pilot Project area gives license or permits for any industrial activities occurring within its defined area of governance.

18.2.4 The Communal Land Forest and Produce Act

The Communal Land Forest and Produce Act aims at improving local management of natural resources in the communal areas by requiring that permits and license be obtained in order to sell forest produce from the communal areas. The Act also seeks to prevent outsiders from gaining access to natural resources and products and removing them from the communal areas. The power to enforce this legislation lies with the Department of Natural Resources and the Police.

18.2.5 The Communal Land Act

The Communal Land Act gives the Rural District Councils power to control the occupation and use of communal areas and prescribe conservation measures in these

areas. The Act attempts to enhance the participation of local communities in the management and use of their natural resources.

18.2.6 The Traditional Leaders Act

The traditional Leaders Act gives traditional leaders power to manage resources conservation within the jurisdiction of a ward or a group of ward allocated to him. Under the traditional leader, there are a number of headman that administer each ward. They are the mediator of dispute that occur within the jurisdiction of their administrative area that is traditionally inherited to today.

Each ward contains a number of village head that leads the village, or traditionally termed as "kraal". Village assembly is a lowest level of formal decision making body. It is paired with "Village Development Committee", which administer economic development of any kind that takes place within the village boundary.

In the case of implementation of the Pilot Project, village level of discussion is the most important tool of designing the project. This has been essentially dealt with through a number of public hearing.

18.3 Institutional Framework for Small-holder Irrigation Schemes

Small-holder irrigation schemes fall under a number of institutions that are located in a number of ministries. In general there have been more continuity than change from the colonial practices before 1980.

The following is the institutions that may be one way or other related to the Pilot Project.

(1) Ministry of Lands and Agriculture

This Ministry is responsible for formulating and implementing policy on agriculture. With respect to small-holder irrigation schemes, it has the duty of formulating appropriate policies, strategies and plans to guide both planners and users of irrigation infrastructure. In discharging these responsibilities, the Ministry is supported by other ministries, departments and organizations.

(2) Department of Agricultural, Technical and Extension Services (Agritex)

This is a government department charged with irrigation development in addition to it's other responsibilities such as planning agricultural projects as well as providing a range of extension services. Unlike other government departments, Agritex has cadres working at the community level with farmers. In irrigation, Agritex' s duties include the identification of potential irrigable land and assessing feasibility of projects. It is also directly involved in planning, design, implementation and operation of small-holder irrigation schemes as well as facilitating inputs by other stakeholders.

(3) Department of Research and Specialist Services (DRSS)

DRSS undertakes soil surveys in order to establish suitability of soils for irrigation.

(4) Zimbabwe National Water Authority (ZINWA)

This is replacing the former Regional Water Authority (RWA) which was tasked with the management of water resources to irrigated lands in the south-eastern low-veldt region of the country by an Act of Parliament in 1998. ZINWA will have jurisdiction over all the country's water resources.

(5) Ministry of Rural Resources and Water Development (MRRWD)

This ministry has overall responsibility for water development in the country and under it fall a number of departments.

(6) Department of Water Resources (DWR)

The DWR under the MRRWD has the mandate for water resources management in the country. It essentially plans, implements and operates water projects or undertakes supervision of projects where non-in house service is sought. It is also supposed to keep an inventory of both surface and underground water and is also supposed to safeguard water quality. Part of DWR will be absorbed in ZINWA.

(7) District Development Fund (DDF)

Falling under the MLGNH, it can be contracted to undertake development of small-holder irrigation scheme.

(8) National Economic Planning Commission (NEPC)

Under the Office of the President, the NEPC vets, approves and prioritizes all public-funded projects including irrigation projects.

(9) Ministry of Finance (MOF)

This is the Ministry responsible for administration of public funds in the country. It also administers project funds which may be government or donor funds. The Ministry is also responsible for negotiating project funds with donors.

(10) Ministry of Local Government and National Housing

The Ministry is responsible for local affairs. It is involved in mobilizing communities for irrigation projects, farmer selection and plot allocation, tasks which it shares with Agritex in all government run irrigation schemes. At district level, it's functions are performed by the Rural District Council and the District Administrator.

(11) Irrigation Management Committee (IMC)

Irrigation Management Committee is set up by the government in every scheme of irrigation. It would act as farmer representative bodies. The lack of a legal status

has compromised them greatly. In the case of the Pilot Project, local residents mentioned that the project should be dealt with "Project Management Committee". This implies IMC in general.

(12) Agricultural Finance Corporation (AFC)

Recently transformed into Agribank by an Act of Parliament of 1999. As a parastatal, it administered finance for lending to farmers. Under it was a revolving fund, the National Farmers Irrigation Fund (NFIF), with a concessionaire interest rate of 9%. However, this has not been widely accessed by communal farmers owing to strict conditions of access.

(13) Non-Governmental Organizations

These organizations are involved in a variety of ways such as project facilitation, project financing and technical support. NGO will play a very important role if collectively functioning with IMC as facilitator of the other aspect of the Pilot Project.

19. Other Development Needs in Relation to the Pilot Project

It is a general understanding that the facility of Gokwe South District Administration has been poorly maintained to date. The government departments stationed with Gokwe South District Administration Office closely related to the project expressed their concern over the difficulties for communication via telephone or via road. Thus, it is very helpful to consider a provision of telephone line with fax machine and a four-wheel drive vehicle within the framework of the Pilot Project for the following central government's departments:

- Agritex;
- Department of Water
- Veterinary Services; and
- District Development Fund.

The above departments are related to the operation and maintenance of the Pilot Project. Thus, provision of proper communication system and vehicles are considered essential part of the Pilot Project.

20. Review of the Existing Administration

(1) Agritex Extension Officer

The right bank of Nyarupakwe River is located within the Agritex's extension area of "Nyamachene" while the left bank is located within Nyarupakwe extension area. There two Agritex Extension Officer, one for each extension area. The number of Agritex Extension Office in Nyarupakwe has to be increased including their capacity of communication with the Agritex office in Gokwe South District Administration.

Mobility of the extension office is also limited at the moment. Thus, provision on the increase of the number of staff, telephone system, provision of vehicle and facility for information dissemination at Nyarupakwe Business Center should be considered as essential. He/she should become a part of the committee as described in the section d for gender issue.

(2) Agricultural Technique Training Center

Because of the new agricultural technique is intended to introduce to the community first time in the history of the local community, during the household survey and public hearing meetings, there have been a large number of the local residents expressed their concern over the training facility for irrigation system imposed upon them. In relation to the section (1) Agritex Extension Office as above, qualified Agritex officer for irrigation management has to be stationed as a part of training program of the Pilot Project.

(3) Representative from ZIMWA

Because of the new agricultural technique of irrigation is intended to introduce paired with water resources development and that the development of the irrigation area relies on the better management of irrigation water including canal, a personnel responsible for water distribution has to be permanently stationed in the project area. He/she should be a part of the committee as is described in the next section.

(4) Gender Issue in Relation to the Project Management

Central to the women's issue is their inferior status, real or imagined, as a result of overt discrimination against them, resulting in unequal opportunities for them in relation to men. Societal values, norms, beliefs and practices, mostly developed and propagated by men, have discriminated against women throughout the various stages of development.

Women's contribution to Zimbabwe's economic development can not be separated from their role and position in their traditional society even before colonialism. This should be measured against the ever-changing position of women brought about by their contact with a more complex, more sophisticated, and technically advanced stage of the past economic development of Zimbabwe. Such achievement cannot come about without a whole change of societal attitudes, cultural norms and values. Equality between sexes must be accepted both mentally and in practice.

It is therefore suggested that women need rights to title of land, access to credit, education and skills training related to all areas of social economic and political activity. In this context, the Project Management Committee should allow at least a female representing her village from the study area.

21. Facilitator of the Pilot Project

It is therefore suggested that women need rights to title of land, access to credit, education and skills training related to all areas of social economic and political activity. In this context, the Project Management Committee should allow at least a female representing her village from the study area.

TABLES

Table 1 (1/2) Interview Guide to Key Informants

Key Issues	Key Informants	Key Questions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Identification of the overall population to be served by the Nyarupakwe Pilot Project * Identification of sub-groups of diversified needs from one area to the other * Socio-economic profile of each sub-group 	<p>GSDA, Agritex EO, VSO, Ward's Local Councillor Local Committee's Chairperson</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Who and Where do you consider to be the legitimate population that should be served by the Nyarupakwe * What categories of different sub-groups can be easily identified? * How do you come about with such categories?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Description and examination of historical activities of agricultural development * Action and efforts made by local population for operation and maintenance * Satisfaction/dissatisfaction with government * Willingness and ability to participate 	<p>GSDA, Agritex EO, Headman</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Have the local people been involved in any agricultural and rural development projects in the past? * In cases where government was involved, how good was the government's involvement? * In what capacity were the people involved? * Who had initiated these projects? Where and why? * What was the community's input? * Was every one involved, if not Why? * In what way did the community benefit? * Was the community willing to participate in the NDP and What could constrain their participation?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Experience of local population with new crops and cropping patterns and its agricultural management * Conflicts among local population * Local customs and beliefs that could influence farmer organisation formation and functioning * Needs of deployment community mobilization 	<p>Agritex EO, VSO, Councillor, Headman</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * How well has introducing new crops and cropping patterns been accepted by the people? * Were there any difference before and after? * Were there any new technological innovations introduced with projects? * Are the activities connected with such projects still
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Differing roles of males and females and time allocation in household and productive activities * Relative access of men and women to resources for the use of agricultural facilities and their potential 	<p>VSO, Traditional Leaders, School Headmasters, Kraal Heads, Shop Owners, Cooperative</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * What type of gender cohesion, if any, is observed in this area? * What household task do women perform?

Note: EO - Extension Officer, VSO - Veterinary Service Officer, GSDA - Gokwe South District Administration

Table 1 (2/2) Interview Guide to Key Informants

Key Issues	Key Informants	Key Questions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Priority of the needs of sub-groups * Differences among sub-groups in terms of priority of needs in Nyarupakwe Pilot Project * Decision making by males and females on major farming activities 	<p>Agritex EO, VSO, Headman, Kraal Heads, Cooperative Managers</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * For each and every sub-group that you have identified, please identify related needs to agricultural development * Specifically how do you think the local population will benefit from an agricultural development? * How would you rank these needs, starting with most * What difficulties do you think men and women participating in irrigation activities? * What agricultural activities do women perform? * What agricultural activities do men perform? * What household tasks do men perform? * Who owns agricultural resources and facilities in this area (i.e. land, equipment, etc.) * Who controls the use of land in this community? * Who decides on major projects and farming activities in this community?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Sub-groups that may be disadvantaged by Nyarupakwe Pilot Project * Socio-economic profile of each vulnerable sub-group * Options of avoiding, mitigating or compensating sub-groups in relation to Nyarupakwe Pilot Project 	<p>Agritex EO, Ward's Local Councillor, VSO, Kraal Heads, Headman, Farmers Sub-groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Who do you think will be disadvantaged by the NDP and how? * Do you think there will be some people who will not be willing to relocate as agricultural project is introduced. * What can be done to make sure that these people will not be greatly affected?

Note: EO - Extension Officer, VSO - Veterinary Service Officer, GSDA - Gokwe South District Administration

Table 2 Population of the Survey Area

Village	Population	Village Area (km ²)	No.of Household	Population Density (Person/km)
1 Survey Area - A				
1) Marumbe	797	12.65	129	63.02
2) Muchina	637	11.00	103	57.87
3) Makarichi	466	18.35	79	25.40
4) Sekema	325	16.20	55	20.03
5) Muza	590	7.60	100	77.63
Sub-total/Average	2,815	65.80	466	42.78
2 Suvey Area - B				
1) Murandu	503	9.40	75	53.46
2) Magonyo	540	9.50	71	56.80
3) Hlamba	243	5.85	32	41.57
4) Jeffrey	415	15.70	62	26.46
Sub-total/Average	1,701	40.45	240	42.04
3 Survey Area - C *				
1) Komboni	166	5.70	23	29.05
2) Gunde	552	9.85	60	56.04
3) Mahvondo	631	6.35	77	99.43
4) Mabarani	745	15.45	81	48.23
5) Mujubeki	194	3.40	43	56.91
6) Mateuro	382	1.65	53	231.27
Sub-total/Average	2,669	42.40	337	62.96
Total/Average	7,185	148.65	1,043	48.34

Note: * - Survery Area - C is the area known to the Survey Team as a result of Stage II Survey's public hearing. They are indirectly affected villages in the downstream area.

Table 3 (1/3) Identified Problems/Needs of the Community

Item	Survey Area - A (Upstream of Dam)												
	Survey Area			Muchina		Marumbe		Muza		Makarichi			
	Male	Female*	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male & Female		
1) Water for:	Livestock Vegetable Gardening Drinking - - - -	Livestock Vegetable Gardening - - - -	- - Drinking - -	Livestock Drinking Cropping - -	Livestock Vegetable gardening - Cropping - Against drought	Livestock Vegetable Gardening Drinking - -	Against drought - -	Against drought - -	Livestock Vegetable Gardening Drinking - -	Against drought - -	Against drought - -	Livestock Vegetable Gardening - Brick making - Domestic Use	
2) Road for:	Marketing - -	Marketing - -	Gokwe(Short-cut) High Bridge -	Marketing to Gokwe Gokwe(Short-cut) High Bridge -	Marketing - High bridge -	Marketing - High bridge -	Marketing - High bridge -	Marketing - High bridge -	Marketing - High bridge -	Marketing - High bridge -	Marketing - High bridge -	Gokwe (short-cut) High bridges -	
3) Market for:	- -	Agricultural products - -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	
4) Institutions for:	Banking Veterinary Service -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	Bank Transportation for Agricultural products -
5) Land for:	Grazing land -	- -	Fenced grazing land -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
6) Medical Service	Amount of medicine at Clinic -	- -	Ambulance -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	Amount of medicine at the Clinic Hospital Ambulance

Table 3 (3/3) Identified Problems/Needs of the Community

Survey Area	Survey Area -B					
	Magonyo		Murandu		Hlamba	
	Male & Female		Male & Female		Male	Female
1) Water for:	Livestock		-	-	-	-
	Drinking		-	-	-	-
	Productive use		-	-	-	-
	Irrigation scheme 7)		-	-	Irrigation scheme 4)	-
	Need to repair Muhacha Dam's spillway		-	-	-	-
2) Road for:	-		-	-	Marketing to Gokwe	-
	Gokwe(Short-cut)		-	-	Gokwe(Short-cut)	-
	High bridges Improvement		High bridges Improvement	-	High Bridge	Better link to main road
3) Market for:	Agricultural products		Agricultural products	-	-	-
	-		-	-	-	-
	-		-	-	-	-
4) Institutions for:	Banking		Banking	-	-	Banking
	-		Need shelling machines	-	-	Dipping for cattle and goats
	Need to improve local livestock breeding through systematic breeding facility		-	-	-	-
	Need to improve transportation for people and agricultural		Transportation of Agricultural products	Transportation of Agricultural products	-	Better bus service and transportation for marketing
	-		Limited knowledge in pest control	-	-	-
5) Land for:	-		-	-	Conserving and improving available grazing area	Fenced grazing areas and paddocks
	Agricultural land 5)		-	-	-	-
	Solve severe soil erosion and gully development that are even threatenine houses		-	-	-	-
6) Medical Service	-		-	-	Availability of medicines	Clean water and electricity
	-		-	-	Hospital with improved facility	-
	Maternity ward		-	-	Ambulance	Mid wives
	Ambulance		-	-	More staff	Ambulance
	More staff		-	-	-	There are no doctors (particularly dentist)
7) Education	-		-	-	-	-
	Skills training center for farmers at Nyarapakwe B.C.		-	-	Relevant and nearby skills training colleges for the local community	Relevant and nearby skills training colleges for the local community
	Improve school facility ans stationary		Improve school facility ans stationary	-	-	-
	-		Build teacher's quarter	-	-	-
	-		-	-	-	-
8) Other Services	-		Pre-school for small children	-	-	-
	Income generation 6)		Income generation 3)	-	-	Income generation 1)
	Shortage of drought power		-	-	Improved availability of drought power	Agricultural input is costly 2)
	Commodity prices are too high. Wholesale is needed		-	-	-	-
	-		Training for building proper granaries	-	-	-
	Telephone		-	-	-	-
	Postal Service		-	-	-	-
Electricity		Electricity	-	Electricity for domestic and industrial use	-	

- Note: 1) - Little vegetable gardening is taking place leading to high prices for leaf vegetables i.e. promotion of income generating programme is necessary. Employment for school leavers should also be generated.
- 2) - High prices for agricultural inputs such as seeds, tractors for plowing.
- 3) - High unemployment: income generating projects should be promoted. They also complain about prices for cotton and maize being very low.
- 4) - Irrigation scheme to mitigate food (shortage and income generation) against drought is considered.
- 5) - No vacant cropping lands are available for young families that are coming up in the community.
- 6) - Need to create income generating and employment programme for school leavers as well as for families to build fenced paddocks for livestock as well as improved toilet facility.
- 7) - Need assistance for pumping water from Muhacha Dam for vegetable gardening.

Table 4 (2/4) Wealth Ranking System of the Community

a. Survey Area - A (continued)

Village	Muchina*		Marumbe **	Muza/Sekema ***	Makarichi
	Male	Female			
2 Better-off	Has grass-thatched roof & only the main bedroom is iron sheet or asbestos roof	Has a homestead	Has a homestead fenced	Has relatively good homestead	Has a house with iron sheet or asbestos roof only for bedroom only and has a toilet at home
	Has at least 10 cattle	Has 2 cattle	Has 5 cattle	Has 13-15 cattle	Has up to 10 cattle, 8 goats 2 sheep and 18 chickens
	Has a plough, scotch cart and a harrow	Has very few agricultural tools	Has a plough, a cultivator, a scotch cart & a bicycle	Has some agricultural tools including a scotch cart, a wheel barrow and a bicycle	Has a scotch art and a plough and a bicycle
	Children go to the local school until Form 4	Send children up to Form 7	-	-	Children reach only O level
	Food is secured for the whole year	Has some chicken and a small vegetable garden	-	-	-
	Gets drinking water from the borehole	-	-	-	-
	-	Has a granary	Has a solar panel	Has a solar panel	-
	-	Does not have excess of crops to sell	Harvest 25 bales of cotton & 5 tonnes of maize	Harvest 12 bales of cotton and 20-30 bags of maize	Harvest 400 bags of maize, 20 bags of cotton, 8 bags of ground nuts
	-	-	Keeps up to 25 chickens	-	-
	-	-	-	Life style depends on the	-
	-	-	-	Take wholesome food but not frequently	-
	-	-	-	Sleep on a three-quarter wire bed	-
-	-	-	Has a radio	Has a radio	
-	-	-	-	Has up to 10 acres of land	
-	-	-	-	Has two wives	
No. of Family	37(35.9%)	37(35.9%)	35 (27.13%)	21 (38.18%)	35 (44.30%)
3 Above-poor	-	-	Has a scotch cart, a plough, a wheel barrow	-	-
	-	-	Has 2 cattle and 3 goats	-	-
	-	-	Harvest 12 bales of cotton & 1 tonne of maize	-	-
	-	-	Has a home	-	-
No. of Family	-	-	43 (33.33%)	-	-

Note: * - Those of Muchina decided to divide the group into male and female. Other kraal members, both male and female, held the meeting together.

** - Those in Marumbe subdivided the wealth ranking into four classes.

*** - Since attendance from Sekema was three people, they were grouped together with those from Muza.

Table 4 (3/4) Wealth Ranking System of the Community

a. Survey Area - A (continued)

Village Category	Muchina*		Marumbe **	Muza/Sekema ***	Makarichi
	Male	Female			
4 Poor	Has no cattle and borrow them from others	Has no cattle, goat or even cat	Has 10 chickens	Owens nothing in his life	Has 2 or less cattle, 3 or less goats, 5 or less chicken
	Has children go to the local school but they are often sent off due to lack of school fees or uniforms	Children do not attend school but live with half-naked and usually has many children	Children do not attend school	Children do not attend school	Children attend up to primary school
	Relies on borrowed plough, scotch cart, harrow and cultivator	-	-	-	-
	Has poor house in the homestead	Has one pole and dagga house that serves for sleeping and cooking	All houses built on pole and dagga	Has no toilet	Has two pole and dagga house with no doors and no toilet
	Begs for clothing	Food insecurity	Has difficulty feeding family	Food insecurity and eats less dried maize	Takes one meal a day
	-	Lives on contract labour	Relies on contract labour weeding other people's fields	Relies on contract labour	-
	-	-	-	Harvests as little as 4 tins of maize	-
	-	-	-	Sleeps on a mat	Sleeps on a mat with one blanket
	-	-	-	Constantly quarrels with his wife	Has up to 10 acres of land
	-	-	-	-	Has one wife
	-	-	-	-	32 (40.51%)
	-	58(56.3%)	44(34.11%)	26 (47.27%)	-

Note: * - Those of Muchina decided to divide the group into male and female. Other kraal members, both male and female, held the meeting together.

** - Those in Marumbe subdivided the wealth ranking into four classes.

*** - Since attendance from Sekema was three people, they were grouped together with those from Muza.

Table 4 (4/4) Wealth Ranking System of the Community

b. Survey Area - B

Village	Magonyo	Murandu	Hlamba
Category			
1 Wealthy	Has a good homestead	Has asbestos-roof house	Has a full home and the plot it fenced
	Has many cattle	Has 10 or more cattle	Has 20 or more cattle
	Has a well	-	Has a deep-well at home
	Self-sufficient of food	-	Self-sufficient of food
	A good farmer	Has surplus produce	-
	Send all children to school	Send children to expensive School	Send children to expensive school
	Has a grinding mill	-	-
	Has a car	Has agricultural machine	-
	Has a shop	-	Has a business
	Has money	Has money in the bank	-
	-	Has a granary	Has a granary
	-	Has water for drinking and for livestock	-
	-	Has goat, chicken & pigs	-
	-	Does not apply for loan	-
	-	Has a toilet	Has a toilet
	-	-	Children are well dressed
	-	Has solar panel	Has a solar panel
	-	Has full set of farming	-
	-	-	Has a TV
	-	-	Drinks strong tea everyday
No. of Family	7 (9.72%)	13 (15.12%)	8 (25.82%)
2 Better-off	Has fewer cattle	Has 5 or less cattle	Has 10 or less cattle
	Has less money	-	-
	Has a good house	Only one of his house is asbestos-roofed house	Has a reasonable house
	-	Has goats and chicken	-
	-	Has a plough and scotch cart	-
	-	Harvest 2 or less tonnes	-
	-	School children are not given all that they need	Children go to local school
	-	Sells fewer crops	-
	-	Relies on credit	-
	-	Has a pit latrine	Has a toilet
	-	-	Has a small radio
	-	-	They dress
	-	-	Just has sufficient food
	-	-	Drinks tea daily
	-	-	Has a granary
	39 (54.17%)	30 (34.88%)	8 (25.81%)
3 Poor	Has nothing	Has 1 or no cattle	Has no cattle
	Depends on temporary job	Depends on working for others	Works for others
	Has no money	Has no money in the bank	-
	-	Has no toilet	Has no toilet but uses bush
	-	Has no agricultural tools	-
	-	Is not self-sufficient of food	Is not self-sufficient of food
	-	Children go not go to school	-
	-	Can't provide his own subsistence requirements	-
	-	Is not eligible for loan	-
	-	-	Has pole and dagga huts
	-	-	Drink no tea daily
	-	-	Children do not go to school
	-	-	Clothing is patched/dirty
	-	-	Has pole and dagga huts
	-	-	Has no shoes
	-	-	Has no granary
	26 (36.11%)	43 (50.00%)	15 (48.39%)

Table 5 (1/2) Identified Institutions/Local Groups of the Community

a. Government/Quasi-government Organizations

Name of Institution	Type of Services
1 AGRITEX	Farming, Soil conservation practice, Pest control, Water harvesting, Master farmer training services
2 Veterinary Services	Disease control (dipping), Diagnosis, Livestock marketing information, Identification marks on livestock for security,
3 Forestry Commission	Afforestation and community forestry programmes, Harvesting forestry products, Veld (South African Savannah) management
4 Natural Resources Board	Veld (South African Savannah) management, Control of soil erosion, Pest control, Control of fishing method
5 Zimbabwe Farmers's Union	Farmers' mouthpiece, Price negotiations, Information services to farmers, Facilitating linkages to other organizations, Selection of seed variations according to the region
6 District Development Fund	Road construction, Tillage, Boreholes
7 Cotton Company of Zimbabwe (COTTCO)	Provision of cotton marketing, Provision of loan for cotton growing, Technical input for cotton growing
8 Agricultural Finance Corporation (AFC)	Provision of loan, Banking facilities
9 Dairy Services	Marketing of milk product
10 Research Institutes	Pest control test, Seed varieties tests
11 Cold Storage Commission	Marketing of livestock, Provision of loan

Note: Despite the fact that Munyati Cooperative Society is very popular, it appears that the persons conducted this PRA exercise were not the member of it and therefore it was not listed up.

Table 5 (2/2) Identified Institutions/Local Groups of the Community

b. Village Organizations Established in the Survey Area - A		Name of Village Organization	Year of Establishment	Function	Membership		
Kraal	Male				Female	Total	
1	Muza	1) Muza Lending Group 2) Chitendero Group 3) Muza Income Generation Group	1992 1996 1998	Farming, Provision of loan, Mailing Farming, Provision of loan, Poultry, Sewing, Saving, Gardening, Pre-school	10 25 2	7 15 11	17 40 13
2	Muchina	1) Muchina Youth Group 2) Muchina Group Lending 3) Simbanabadza Group 4) Muchina Burial Society 5) Arsenal Football Club 6) Muchina Club	1993 1992 1992 1984 1993 1995	Farming Farming, Provision of loan, Mailing Poultry, Gardening Burial Services, Savings Farming, Entertainment Gardening, Poultry, Sewing	16 10 12 7 23 0	7 12 4 4 0 20	23 22 16 11 23 20
3	Marumbe	1) Vanavevhu 2) Chumbu Group Lending 3) Scud Missile	1994 1992 1992	Farming, Provision of loan, Provision of loan, & Mailing Football & Entertainment	40 9 30	23 7 0	63 16 30
4	Makarichi	1) Makarich Group Lending 2) Pepukai Burial Society 3) Kushinga Women's Group 4) Tambanvevhu Club 5) Murume Mukuru Club 6) Murume Mukuru Football Club	1991 1999 1992 1992 1994 1994	Provision of loan, Farming Burial Services, Savings Farming, Sewing Farming, Provision of loan, Farming, Sewing Football & Entertainment	15 8 12 30 3 30	0 8 17 23 15 3	15 16 29 53 18 33
5	Inter-kraal Institutions	1) Zviitirei Club 2) Nyarupakwe Cattle Fattening 3) Nyamacheni Club 4) Nyarupakwe Good Farming Competition 5) Tongwe Young Farmers' Club 6) Nyamacheni Central 7) Tongwe Disabled Cooperative Society	1959 1982 1992 1978 1998 1991 2000	Sewing, Gardening, Banking, Singing, Net ball, Volley ball Cattle fattening, Cattle marketing Farming competitions, Provision of loan Farming competitions Provision of loan for farming equipment, Group purchasing Provision of loan, Farming competition Gardening, General dealer/store, Grinding mill, Bottle store,	5 50 10 50 4 40 8	32 3 0 60 3 36 2	37 53 10 110 7 76 10

Table 6 (1/3) Gender Issues of the Community

a. Typical Daily Activities of a Married Couple in Survey Area - A

(1) Rainy Season

	Male's Role	Time of the Day *	Female's Role
Morning	Wake-up	5:00 AM	Wake-up Light up fire to make hot water for bathing and cooking Fetching water for bathing and cooking
	Checking of cattle	6:30 AM	Preparation of Bathing for husband and children and herself
	Prepare pest control mixture Spray pesticide	Bathing	Preparation of porridge and tea
	Weeding in the field	Breakfast/Tea Break	Washing kitchen utensils and table ware Cleaning the house and washing clothes Weeding in the field Preparation of lunch
		Lunch	
Afternoon	Spraying Pesticide Washing spray equipment		Washing kitchen utensils and table ware Fetching water for bathing and cooking Weeding Nursing sweet potatoes Preparation of bathing for husband and children and herself
		Bathing	Preparation of dinner
	Planing for tomorrow	Dinner	Washing kitchen utensils and table ware Prayer
		Sleeping	

Note: Eating and bathing shared essentially by all of the members of family.

(2) Dry Season

	Male's Role	Time of the Day *	Female's Role
Morning	Wake-up	At sun-rise	Wake-up Light up fire for making hot water for bathing and cooking Fetching water for bathing and cooking Preparation of Bathing for husband and children and herself
	Checking of cattle and chicken	Bathing	Preparation of porridge and tea
	Checking crops	Breakfast/Tea Break	Washing kitchen utensils and table ware Plants vegetables and sweet potatoes Cleaning the house and washing clothes Prepare lunch
	Pole cutting Repairing fences		
		Lunch Break	
Afternoon	Attending the vegetable garden		Washing kitchen utensils and table ware Collecting vegetables in the garden Fetching water for bathing and cooking Preparation of Bathing for husband and children and herself
		Bathing	Preparation of dinner
	Planing for tomorrow	Dinner	Washing kitchen utensils and table ware Prayer
		Sleeping	

Note: Eating and bathing shared essentially by all of the members of family.

Table 6 (2/3) Gender Issues of the Community

b. Control of Household's Resources

Kraal Resources	Owner	Accessibility	Control/Decision Maker
1 Makarici 1) Cattle 2) Field/Land 3) Agricultural input 4) Plough 5) Hoe 6) Chicken 7) Kitchen Utensils	Husband Husband Husband Husband Husband Wife Wife	Husband Husband Husband Husband Husband Wife Wife	Husband Husband Husband Husband Husband Husband Wife
2 Muchina 1) Cattle 2) Goats 3) Sheep 4) Pigs 5) Donkeys 6) Chicken 7) Cotton (Product) 8) Maize 9) Minor Grains	Husband Both Husband Husband Husband Both Husband Both Wife	Both Both Husband Husband Both Both Husband Both Wife	Husband Husband* Husband* Husband Husband Both Husband Both Wife
3 Marumbe 1) Cattle 2) Goats 3) Plough 4) Carts 5) Wheel Barrow 6) Hoe/Chain 7) Shovels 8 Furniture 9) Houses 10) Money 11) Field/Land 12) Input 13) Agricultural yield	Husband Husband Husband Husband Wife Husband Husband Wife Husband Husband Husband Husband Both	Both Both Both Both Both Both Husband Both Husband Both Husband Both	Husband Husband Husband Husband Both Both Husband Both Husband Husband Husband Husband Husband

Note: * - Wife is consulted with Husband for the sale of the Husband's resources.

Table 6 (3/3) Gender Issues of the Community

c. Control of Resources (continued)

Kraal Resources	Owner	Accessibility	Control/Decision Maker
4 Sekema 1) House 2) Field/Land 3) Livestock 4) Agriculture equipment 5) Household goods	Both Both Husband Husband Wife	Both Wife Both Both Both	Both Both Both Husband M
5 Muza 1) Cattle 2) Goats 3) CHusbandickens 4) SHusbandeep 5) HusbandouseHusbandold goods 6) Field/Land 7) Agricultural equipment 8) Agricultural input 9) Agricultural yield	Husband Husband Wife Husband Wife Husband Husband Both Both	Both Both Both Husband Both Both Both Both Both	Husband Both Wife Husband Both Both Husband Husband Husband

Table 7 (1/2) Individual Household Survey

a. Survey Areas for Quantitative Survey

Village Name	Total No. of Household	* No. of Qty. Survey	%	** No. of Qty. Survey	%
1 Survey Area - A					
1) Marumbe	129	14	10.9	18	14.0
2) Muchina	103	18	17.5	19	18.4
3) Makarichi	79	20	25.3	18	22.8
4) Sekema	55	16	29.1	19	34.5
5) Muza	100	13	13.0	13	13.0
Sub-total	466	81	17.4	87	18.7
2 Survey Area - B					
1) Hlamba***	32	17	53.1	18	56.3
2) Magonyo	71	20	28.2	21	29.6
3) Murandu	75	19	25.3	19	25.3
4) Jeffrey	62	20	32.3	18	29.0
Sub-total	240	76	31.7	76	31.7
3 Survey Area - C					
1) Komboni	23	10	43.5	10	43.5
2) Mahvondo	77	10	13.0	10	13.0
3) Mateuro	53	10	18.9	10	18.9
4) Gunde	60	10	16.7	10	16.7
5) Mabarani	81	10	12.3	10	12.3
6) Mujubeki	43	10	23.3	10	23.3
Sub-total	337	60	17.8	60	17.8
Total	1043	217	20.8	223	21.4

- Note: * - Based on quantitative survey questionnaire, the enumerator collected data of the separate households other than the enumerator collected data with open-ended questionnaire in each village. Any numbers less than 20 are of which the deficit is the number of households absent at the time of survey.
- ** - The enumerator collected data of the separate households other than the enumerator collected data with quantitative survey questionnaire. Any numbers less than 20 are of which deficit is the number of households absent at the time of survey.
- *** - Some households are interviewed by the enumerators for qualitative survey questionnaire and quantitative survey questionnaire. As a result some households are visited by two enumerators.

Table 7 (2/2) Individual Household Survey

b. Subgrouping of Qualitative Survey

Village Name	Total No. of Household	* No. of Qty. Survey	%	** No. of Qty. Survey	%
1 Subgroup 1					
1) Marumbe	129	14	10.9	18	14.0
2) Muchina	103	18	17.5	19	18.4
Sub-total	232	32	13.8	37	15.9
2 Subgroup 2					
1) Makarichi	79	20	25.3	18	22.8
2) Sekema	55	16	29.1	19	34.5
3) Muza	100	13	13.0	13	13.0
Sub-total	234	49	20.9	50	21.4
3 Subgroup 3					
1) Hlamba	32	17	53.1	18	56.3
2) Magonyo	71	20	28.2	21	29.6
	103	37	35.9	39	37.9
4 Subgroup 4					
1) Murandu	75	19	25.3	19	25.3
2) Komboni	23	10	43.5	10	43.5
3) Mahvondo	77	10	13.0	10	13.0
4) Mateuro	53	10	18.9	10	18.9
5) Jeffrey	62	20	32.3	18	29.0
Sub-total	290	69	23.8	67	23.1
5 Subgroup 5					
1) Gunde	60	10	16.7	10	16.7
2) Mabarani	81	10	12.3	10	12.3
3) Mujubeki	43	10	23.3	10	23.3
Sub-total	184	30	16.3	30	16.3
Total	1043	217	20.8	223	21.4

Note: * - Based on quantitative survey questionnaire, the enumerator collected data of the separate households other than the enumerator collected data with open-ended questionnaire in each village. Any numbers less than 20 are of which the deficit is the number of households absent at the time of survey.

** - The enumerator collected data of the separate households other than the enumerator collected data with quantitative survey questionnaire. Any numbers less than 20 are of which deficit is the number of households absent at the time of survey.

*** - Some households are interviewed by the enumerators for qualitative survey questionnaire and quantitative survey questionnaire. As a result some households are visited by two enumerators.

Table 8 (1/29) Result of Household Survey

a. Overall Survey Area and the Study Area - A

Item	Overall Survey Area	No. of Households					Average/ Total	%
		Marumbe	Muchina	Makarich	Muza	Sekema		
1 Human Characteristics of Household								
1) Gender of Household								
a. Male	171	11	15	16	13	13	68	84.0
b. Female	41	3	3	3	-	3	12	14.8
c. Invalid Answer	5	-	-	1	-	-	1	1.2
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
2) Age of the Head of Household								
Average (Years-old)	47.9	54.7	39.5	41.8	44.8	49.4	46.0	-
a. Up to 20	23	1	0	0	0	2	3	3.7
b. 21 - 30	28	2	2	1	1	0	6	7.4
c. 31 - 40	50	2	2	1	1	2	8	9.9
d. 41 - 50	34	4	0	4	1	3	12	14.8
e. 51 - 60	31	1	5	3	4	4	17	21.0
f. 61 - 70	27	2	5	6	6	1	20	24.7
g. More than 71	24	2	4	5	0	4	15	18.5
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
3) Size of Household								
Population of Interviewed Households	1,339	77	121	109	85	96	488	-
Average (Person/household)	6.03	5.5	6.7	5.5	6.5	6.0	6.0	-
a. 2 - 3 persons	47	2	5	6	0	5	18	22.2
b. 4 - 5 persons	51	4	3	5	3	1	16	19.8
c. 6 - 7 persons	61	6	4	5	6	6	27	33.3
d. 8 - 9 persons	35	2	4	1	4	4	15	18.5
e. More than 10	23	0	2	3	0	0	5	6.2
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
4) Level of Education (Head of H/H)								
a. No Formal Education	28	1	0	2	1	2	6	7.4
b. Drop-out of Primary School	51	3	7	3	7	8	28	34.6
c. Primary School Graduated	24	1	2	4	1	1	9	11.1
d. Drop-out of Secondary School	45	5	4	4	1	3	17	21.0
e. Secondary School Graduated	45	4	5	2	3	2	16	19.8
f. Drop-out of High School	19	0	0	2	0	0	2	2.5
g. High School Graduate	3	0	0	3	0	0	3	3.7
h. More than High School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
i. No Answer	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
5) Level of Education (Overall - Male)								
a. No Formal Education	157	4	8	9	11	12	44	18.6
b. Drop-out of Primary School	93	9	17	4	7	4	41	17.4
c. Primary School Graduated	124	7	8	19	11	12	57	24.2
d. Drop-out of Secondary School	108	8	13	7	6	7	41	17.4
e. Secondary School Graduated	123	10	14	13	6	8	51	21.6
f. Drop-out of High School	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	0.4
g. High School Graduate	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	0.4
h. More than High School	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
i. No Answer	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	678	38	60	53	42	43	236	100.0
6) Level of Education (Overall - Female)*								
a. No Formal Education	155	6	7	16	11	10	50	21.1
b. Drop-out of Primary School	98	12	12	13	9	8	54	22.8
c. Primary School Graduated	130	8	12	11	8	14	53	22.4
d. Drop-out of Secondary School	102	5	6	7	6	8	32	13.5
e. Secondary School Graduated	99	8	9	6	8	12	43	18.1
f. Drop-out of High School	38	0	0	1	1	0	2	0.8
g. High School Graduate	13	0	0	2	0	1	3	1.3
h. More than High School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
i. No Answer	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	646	39	46	56	43	53	237	100.0
7) Ratio of Gender Distribution (%)								
a. Male	50.6	49.4	49.6	48.6	49.4	44.8	-	48.4
b. Female	49.4	50.6	50.4	51.4	50.6	55.2	-	51.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0
8) Occupation of the Head of Household								
a. Farmer	109	6	8	8	6	7	35	43.2
b. Wage Labour	42	4	4	6	1	3	18	22.2
c. Salaried Worker	29	2	2	3	2	2	11	13.6
d. Private Business Owner	19	2	2	1	2	2	9	11.1
e. Pension Receiver	16	0	1	2	2	2	7	8.6
f. Jobless	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.2
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0

Note: * - There has been 15 cases where no answer was given in the case of Female in Muchina.

Table 8 (2/29) Result of Household Survey

a. Study Area - A (continued)

Item	Overall Survey Area	No. of Households					Average/ Total	%
		Marumbe	Muchina	Makarich	Muza	Sekema		
9) Occupation (Overall)								
a. Infant	188	13	17	16	18	16	80	16.4
b. School Children and Students	340	19	39	32	19	33	142	29.1
c. Farmer	589	37	32	45	43	35	192	39.3
d. Wage Labour	45	3	6	6	3	8	26	5.3
e. Salaried Worker	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. Pensioner	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. Private Business Owner	38	1	15	1	2	2	21	4.3
h. Jobless	85	4	12	9	0	2	27	5.5
i. No Answer	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	1339	77	121	109	85	96	488	100.0
10) Gender Distribution of Farmers								
a. Male	269	20	16	22	20	17	95	49.5
b. Female	320	17	16	23	23	18	97	50.5
Total	589	37	32	45	43	35	192	100.0
2) Economic Characteristics of Households								
1) Sources of Income - Primary								
a. Crop Sales	136	2	9	7	6	12	36	44.4
b. Livestock/Dairy Products Sales	56	10	9	12	7	3	41	50.6
c. Sales of Home Industry Products	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Salary	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Wage from Temporary Job	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. Pension	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. Remittance from Family	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. Private Business	4	2	0	1	0	1	4	4.9
i. No Other Sources	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
2) Sources of Income - Secondary								
a. Crop Sales	47	4	2	0	0	0	6	7.4
b. Livestock/Dairy Products Sales	32	2	0	1	0	1	4	4.9
c. Sales of Home Industry Products	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Salary	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Wage from Temporary Job	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.2
f. Pension	22	4	5	0	4	2	15	18.5
g. Remittance from Family	4	1	2	0	1	0	4	4.9
h. Private Business	9	2	1	3	0	3	9	11.1
i. No Other Sources	72	1	8	15	8	10	42	51.9
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
3) Sources of Income - Tertiary								
a. Crop Sales	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Livestock/Dairy Products Sales	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Sales of Home Industry Products	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.2
d. Salary	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Wage from Temporary Job	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.2
f. Pension	13	2	1	0	1	0	4	4.9
g. Remittance from Family	9	0	3	0	0	0	3	3.7
h. Private Business	18	7	2	4	2	2	17	21.0
i. No Other Sources	135	4	11	16	10	14	55	67.9
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
4) Value of Income - Primary Income (Z\$)								
Average	39,759	40,507	33,833	37,835	46,077	40,839	39,818	-
a. No Income/No Answer	11	1	2	4	2	0	9	10.9
b. Up to 10,000	35	1	2	3	0	1	7	8.7
c. 10,000 - 25,000	49	3	6	2	2	8	21	26.0
d. 25,000 - 50,000	55	5	3	6	5	4	23	28.5
e. 50,001 - 75,000	37	3	4	3	2	0	12	14.9
f. 75,001 - 100,000	14	0	1	1	1	2	5	6.2
g. 100,001 - 125,000	11	1	0	0	1	1	3	3.7
h. More than 125,000	5	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.2
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
5) Value of Income - Secondary Income (Z\$)								
Average	12,372	16,400	4,833	6,230	5,077	6,349	7,778	-
a. No Income/No Answer	102	1	11	15	9	9	45	55.6
b. Up to 10,000	30	3	1	2	1	1	8	9.9
c. 10,000 - 25,000	32	1	2	0	2	6	11	13.6
d. 25,000 - 50,000	22	6	3	3	1	0	13	16.0
e. 50,001 - 75,000	21	3	1	0	0	0	4	4.9
f. 75,001 - 100,000	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. 100,001 - 125,000	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 125,000	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0

Table 8 (3/29) Result of Household Survey

a. Study Area - A (continued)

Item	Overall Survey Area	No. of Households					Average/ Total	%
		Marumbe	Muchina	Makarich	Muza	Sekema		
6) Value of Income - Tertiary Income (Z\$)								
Average	8,117	12,166	4,000	1,357	8,615	4,625	6,153	-
a. No Income/No Answer	145	4	13	16	11	15	59	72.8
b. Up to 10,000	33	7	2	4	1	0	14	17.3
c. 10,000 - 25,000	8	0	2	0	0	0	2	2.5
d. 25,000 - 50,000	12	1	1	0	0	0	2	2.5
e. 50,001 - 75,000	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.2
f. 75,001 - 100,000	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.2
g. 100,001 - 125,000	3	1	0	0	1	0	2	2.5
h. More than 125,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
7) Total Area of Land Holding (ha/family)								
Average (ha)	4.7	6.2	5.9	3.1	1.8	1.7	3.8	-
a. Up to 0.4 ha (Incl. Landless)	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	3.7
b. 0.4 - 2 ha	57	0	1	10	8	9	28	34.6
c. 2.1 - 4.1 ha	68	0	1	2	4	4	11	13.6
d. 4.2 - 6.2 ha	49	8	7	4	1	0	20	24.7
e. 6.3 - 8.3 ha	12	3	3	3	0	0	9	11.1
f. 8.4 - 10.3 ha	17	1	2	1	0	0	4	4.9
g. More than 10.4 ha	8	2	4	0	0	0	6	7.4
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
8) Area of Agricultural Land (ha/family)								
Average (ha)	3.9	6.11	4.67	2.07	1.45	0.95	3.05	-
a. Up to 0.4 ha (Incl. Landless)	12	0	0	3	0	3	6	7.4
b. 0.4 - 2 ha	71	0	0	11	10	10	31	38.3
c. 2.1 - 4.1 ha	67	0	10	1	3	3	17	21.0
d. 4.2 - 6.2 ha	39	8	3	2	0	0	13	16.0
e. 6.3 - 8.3 ha	8	3	0	2	0	0	5	6.2
f. 8.4 - 10.3 ha	11	1	0	1	0	0	2	2.5
g. More than 10.4 ha	9	2	5	0	0	0	7	8.6
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
9) Area of Vegetable Garden (ha/family)								
Average (ha)	0.2	0.29	0.62	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.20	-
a. Up to 0.1 ha (Incl. Landless)	137	0	0	20	13	15	48	59.3
b. 0.1 - 0.2 ha	27	6	0	0	0	0	6	7.4
c. 0.3 - 0.4 ha	14	5	0	0	0	0	5	6.2
d. 0.5 - 0.6 ha	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. 0.7 - 0.8 ha	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.2
f. 0.9 - 1.0 ha	21	0	17	0	0	1	18	22.2
g. More than 1 ha	3	2	1	0	0	0	3	3.7
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
10) Area of Homestead (ha/family)								
Average (ha)	0.6	0.99	0.62	0.29	0.17	0.29	0.47	-
a. Up to 0.5 ha (Incl. Landless)	65	1	5	12	3	6	27	33.3
b. 0.6 - 1.0 ha	78	2	2	0	0	6	10	12.3
c. 1.1 - 1.5 ha	38	0	8	1	1	3	13	16.0
d. 1.6 - 2.0 ha	26	8	3	6	6	0	23	28.4
e. 2.1 - 2.5 ha	6	1	0	1	3	0	5	6.2
f. 2.6 - 3.0 ha	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.2
g. More than 3 ha	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	2.5
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
11) Cropping Area - Cotton (ha/family)								
Average (ha)	1.9	2.63	0.66	1.66	0.52	1.25	1.34	-
a. Up to 0.4 ha	62	2	8	10	10	8	38	46.9
b. 0.4 - 2 ha	73	4	8	4	3	6	25	30.9
c. 2.1 - 4.1 ha	21	1	0	2	0	0	3	3.7
d. 4.2 - 6.2 ha	28	2	2	1	0	1	6	7.4
e. 6.3 - 8.3 ha	14	1	0	1	0	0	2	2.5
f. 8.4 - 10.3 ha	13	3	0	1	0	1	5	6.2
g. More than 10.4 ha	6	1	0	1	0	0	2	2.5
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
12) Cropping Area - Maize (ha/family)								
Average (ha)	1.19	1.55	1.74	1.03	0.55	0.55	1.08	-
a. Up to 0.4 ha	84	4	3	11	2	14	34	42.0
b. 0.4 - 2 ha	54	6	6	5	2	2	21	25.9
c. 2.1 - 4.1 ha	42	1	5	3	2	0	11	13.6
d. 4.2 - 6.2 ha	20	3	3	1	2	0	9	11.1
e. 6.3 - 8.3 ha	11	0	1	0	3	0	4	4.9
f. 8.4 - 10.3 ha	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	2.5
g. More than 10.4 ha	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0

Table 8 (4/29) Result of Household Survey

a. Study Area - A (continued)

Item	Overall Survey Area	No. of Households					Average/ Total	%
		Marumbe	Muchina	Makarich	Muza	Sekema		
13) Cropping Area - Groundnuts (ha/family)								
Average	0.45	0.36	0.35	0.29	0.11	1.25	0.47	-
a. Up to 0.4 ha	87	2	7	8	10	10	37	45.7
b. 0.4 - 2 ha	26	5	10	0	0	0	15	18.5
c. 2.1 - 4.1 ha	41	3	0	9	3	5	20	24.7
d. 4.2 - 6.2 ha	37	2	0	2	0	1	5	6.2
e. 6.3 - 8.3 ha	10	1	1	0	0	0	2	2.5
f. 8.4 - 10.3 ha	11	1	0	1	0	0	2	2.5
g. More than 10.4 ha	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
14) Crop Production - Cotton								
Average (bale/family)**	13.0	15.9	5.7	16.9	6.7	9.7	11.0	-
a. No Production	34	1	1	3	0	1	6	7.4
b. Up to 5 bales	52	1	1	1	0	6	9	11.1
c. 6 - 10 bales	42	2	11	1	5	3	22	27.2
d. 11 - 15 bales	32	4	3	2	5	4	18	22.2
e. 16 - 20 bales	22	2	1	2	2	0	7	8.6
f. 21 - 25 bales	20	1	1	6	1	2	11	13.6
g. 25 - 30 bales	9	1	0	2	0	0	3	3.7
h. More than 30 bales	6	2	0	3	0	0	5	6.2
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
15) Crop Production - Maize								
Average (bale/family)**	32.5	75.2	47.6	33.15	40.9	19.7	43.3	-
a. No Production	34	0	1	0	2	1	4	4.9
b. Up to 10 bales	24	3	2	6	0	3	14	17.3
c. 11 - 20 bales	35	4	6	6	2	4	22	27.2
d. 21 - 30 bales	27	2	1	3	4	3	13	16.0
e. 31 - 40 bales	31	0	2	0	2	4	8	9.9
f. 41 - 50 bales	31	0	0	2	0	0	2	2.5
g. 51 - 60 bales	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 60 bales	21	5	6	3	3	1	18	22.2
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
16) Crop Production - Groundnuts								
Average (bale/family)**	8.6	10.3	7.1	11.2	2.84	5.8	7.4	-
a. No Production	87	0	5	6	7	10	28	34.6
b. Up to 10 bales	50	4	8	6	0	4	22	27.2
c. 11 - 20 bales	29	1	3	6	1	1	12	14.8
d. 21 - 30 bales	22	2	2	0	5	1	10	12.3
e. 31 - 40 bales	10	1	0	1	0	0	2	2.5
f. 41 - 50 bales	8	2	0	0	0	0	2	2.5
g. 51 - 60 bales	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 60 bales	5	4	0	1	0	0	5	6.2
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
17) Home Consumption - Cotton								
Average (bale/family)**	1.8	0.2	0	0	0.0	9.7	2.0	-
a. No Consumption	210	13	18	20	13	15	79	97.5
b. Up to 5 bales	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.2
c. 6 - 10 bales	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.2
d. 11 - 15 bales	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. 16 - 20 bales	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. 21 - 25 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. 25 - 30 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 30 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
18) Home Consumption - Maize								
Average (bale/family)**	19.2	50.9	21.6	20.1	22.1	12.0	25.3	-
a. No Consumption	32	1	2	0	2	2	7	8.6
b. Up to 10 bales	42	3	4	12	4	2	25	30.9
c. 11 - 20 bales	48	5	4	3	2	7	21	25.9
d. 21 - 30 bales	42	1	4	4	1	3	13	16.0
e. 31 - 40 bales	22	0	2	0	2	2	6	7.4
f. 41 - 50 bales	14	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.7
g. 51 - 60 bales	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 60 bales	6	4	1	1	0	0	6	7.4
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0

Note: ** - 1 bale = 50 kg

Table 8 (5/29) Result of Household Survey

a. Study Area - A (continued)

Item	Overall Survey Area	No. of Households					Average/ Total	%
		Marumbe	Muchina	Makarich	Muza	Sekema		
19) Home Consumption - Groundnuts								
Average (bale/family)**	6.2	8.4	6.2	7.8	2.0	3.3	5.5	-
a. No Consumption	95	1	4	6	8	11	30	37.0
b. Up to 10 bales	54	2	7	9	0	4	22	27.2
c. 11 - 20 bales	27	2	5	3	1	0	11	13.6
d. 21 - 30 bales	17	1	0	0	4	1	6	7.4
e. 31 - 40 bales	11	1	2	1	0	0	4	4.9
f. 41 - 50 bales	5	3	0	0	0	0	3	3.7
g. 51 - 60 bales	6	2	0	1	0	0	3	3.7
h. More than 60 bales	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2.5
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
20) Debt/Rent Exchange - Cotton								
Average (bale/family)**	0.48	0.29	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.1	-
a. No Exchange	210	11	18	19	13	16	77	95.1
b. Up to 5 bales	6	3	0	1	0	0	4	4.9
c. 6 - 10 bales	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. 11 - 15 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. 16 - 20 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. 21 - 25 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. 25 - 30 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 30 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
21) Debt/Rent Exchange - Maize								
Average (bale/family)**	2.4	3.0	4.5	3.6	3.2	0.0	2.9	-
a. No Exchange	150	8	2	8	7	16	41	50.6
b. Up to 10 bales	28	4	2	3	6	0	15	18.5
c. 11 - 20 bales	14	2	4	3	0	0	9	11.1
d. 21 - 30 bales	11	0	5	3	0	0	8	9.9
e. 31 - 40 bales	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. 41 - 50 bales	9	0	4	3	0	0	7	8.6
g. 51 - 60 bales	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 60 bales	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.2
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
22) Debt/Rent Exchange - Groundnuts								
Average (bale/family)**	1.20	0.14	0.00	0.20	0.05	0.00	0.08	-
a. No Exchange	196	13	18	19	12	16	78	96.3
b. Up to 10 bales	12	1	0	1	1	0	3	3.7
c. 11 - 20 bales	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. 21 - 30 bales	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. 31 - 40 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. 41 - 50 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. 51 - 60 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 60 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
23) Marketing Practice - Cotton								
a. Locally Marketed	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Sold to Nearest Villages	45	0	0	2	0	0	2	2.5
c. Sold to Gokwe/Sanyati	94	12	18	15	12	16	73	90.1
d. Sold to Private Dealers	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Sold to Grain Marketing Board	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. Contract Secured for Sale	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. No Answer/Invalid Answer	51	2	0	3	1	0	6	7.4
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
24) Marketing Practice - Maize								
a. Locally Marketed	24	0	0	11	1	0	12	14.8
b. Sold to Nearest Villages	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Sold to Gokwe/Sanyati	18	0	0	0	6	5	11	13.6
d. Sold to Private Dealers	15	3	0	3	0	0	6	7.4
e. Sold to Grain Marketing Board	38	3	10	3	0	1	17	21.0
f. Contract Secured for Sale	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.2
g. No Answer/Invalid Answer	119	7	8	3	6	10	34	42.0
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
25) Marketing Practice - Groundnuts								
a. Locally Marketed	9	0	2	3	0	0	5	6.2
b. Sold to Nearest Villages	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Sold to Gokwe/Sanyati	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Sold to Private Dealers	25	5	0	0	0	0	5	6.2
e. Sold to Grain Marketing Board	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. Contract Secured for Sale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. No Answer/Invalid Answer	172	9	16	17	13	16	71	87.7
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0

Table 8 (6/29) Result of Household Survey

a. Study Area - A (continued)

Item	Overall Survey Area	No. of Households					Average/ Total	%
		Marumbe	Muchina	Makarich	Muza	Sekema		
26) Damages to Farming Area - Drought								
Average Damaged Area (ha)	2.0	0	1.8	0	1.7	1.4	0.98	-
a. Once in the Past	37	0	1	17	4	0	22	27.2
b. Occasionally	87	6	2	1	7	12	28	34.6
c. Regularly	14	7	1	0	0	1	9	11.1
d. None	79	1	14	2	2	3	22	27.2
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
27) Damages to Farming Area - Gully Erosion								
Average Damaged Area (ha)	2.5	1.6	0.8	0.2	0	0.1	0.54	-
a. Once in the Past	14	2	1	4	0	2	9	11.1
b. Occasionally	35	3	3	5	0	1	12	14.8
c. Regularly	19	5	3	1	0	1	10	12.3
d. None	149	4	11	10	13	12	50	61.7
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
28) Damages to Farming Area - Sheet Erosion								
Average Damaged Area (ha)	0.8	0.9	1.1	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.54	-
a. Once in the Past	27	4	2	2	1	0	9	11.1
b. Occasionally	21	3	4	3	2	7	19	23.5
c. Regularly	17	1	3	3	0	1	8	9.9
d. None	152	6	9	12	10	8	45	55.6
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
29) Average Annual Expenditure (Z\$/family)								
a. Food	13,585	10,193	11,806	8,370	12,923	9,300	10,518	35.8
b. Clothing	10,231	11,393	8,389	8,265	10,000	12,681	10,145	34.5
c. Education	3,312	2,066	2,444	8,150	1,771	4,178	3,722	12.7
d. Farming Input	2,004	2,227	3,721	804	5,292	918	2,592	8.8
e. Others	8,133	5,443	4,280	32,620	1,194	21,225	12,952	44.0
Total	37,267	31,321	30,639	58,209	31,179	48,302	29,412	100.0
3 Socio-economic Characteristics of Households								
1) Title Holder of Land								
a. Husband	145	11	1	3	9	10	34	42.0
b. Wife	34	3	7	3	1	3	17	21.0
c. Husband's Father	5	0	0	0	2	1	3	3.7
d. Husband's Mother	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	2.5
e. Wife's Father	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. Wife's Mother	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. Not Registered	15	0	0	14	1	0	15	18.5
h. Unknown	14	0	10	0	0	0	10	12.3
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
2) Reliability of Water Resources-River								
a. Permanently Available	56	10	5	1	3	2	21	25.9
b. Seasonally Available	79	4	1	11	9	14	39	48.1
c. Timely Available/Maintained	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Available at Random	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.2
e. Not Available	81	0	12	7	1	0	20	24.7
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
3) Reliability of Water Resources - Well								
a. Permanently Available	92	11	18	19	7	16	71	87.7
b. Seasonally Available	18	2	0	1	3	0	6	7.4
c. Timely Available/Maintained	22	0	0	0	3	0	3	3.7
d. Available at Random	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Not Available	85	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.2
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
4) Reliability of Water Resources - Borehole								
a. Permanently Available	36	0	12	0	7	0	19	23.5
b. Seasonally Available	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Timely Available/Maintained	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Available at Random	32	0	0	0	5	0	5	6.2
e. Not Available	120	14	6	20	1	16	57	70.4
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
5) Reliability of Water Resources - Others								
a. Permanently Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Seasonally Available	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	2.5
c. Timely Available/Maintained	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Available at Random	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Not Available	213	14	18	20	13	14	79	97.5
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0

Table 8 (7/29) Result of Household Survey

a. Study Area - A (continued)

Item	Overall Survey Area	No. of Households					Average/ Total	%
		Marumbe	Muchina	Makarich	Muza	Sekema		
6) Use of Water Resources - River								
a. Drinking/Domestic Use	48	14	6	8	2	3	33	40.7
b. Fishing	25	0	0	0	0	12	12	14.8
c. Watering Crops	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Livestock	48	0	0	12	11	1	24	29.6
e. No Answer	95	0	12	0	0	0	12	14.8
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
7) Use of Water Resources - Well								
a. Drinking/Domestic Use	119	13	18	20	13	15	79	97.5
b. Fishing	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Watering Crops	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	2.5
d. Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. No Answer	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
8) Use of Water Resources - Borehole								
a. Drinking/Domestic Use	91	0	11	0	6	0	17	21.0
b. Fishing	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Watering Crops	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Livestock	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.2
e. No Answer	118	14	7	20	7	15	63	77.8
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
9) Use of Water Resources - Others								
a. Drinking/Domestic Use	3	1	0	1	0	0	2	2.5
b. Fishing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Watering Crops	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Livestock	12	11	0	1	0	0	12	14.8
e. No Answer	202	2	18	18	13	16	67	82.7
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
10) Experiences of Supporting Services AGRITEX								
a. Every Year	88	9	5	14	7	2	37	45.7
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	15	1	1	0	3	1	6	7.4
c. Once in the Past 5 years	13	2	0	0	0	1	3	3.7
d. No Services Made Available	48	2	11	0	3	12	28	34.6
e. No Answer	53	0	1	6	0	0	7	8.6
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
11) Experiences of Supporting Services Veterinary Services								
a. Every Year	131	6	14	14	9	5	48	59.3
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	13	4	1	1	1	0	7	8.6
c. Once in the Past 5 years	13	2	0	0	1	0	3	3.7
d. No Services Made Available	33	2	2	0	1	11	16	19.8
e. No Answer	27	0	1	5	1	0	7	8.6
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
12) Experiences of Supporting Services NGOs								
a. Every Year	5	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.7
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.2
c. Once in the Past 5 years	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.2
d. No Services Made Available	91	5	16	6	6	15	48	59.3
e. No Answer	92	9	1	13	5	0	28	34.6
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
13) Experiences of Supporting Services Munyati Cooperative								
a. Every Year	44	1	5	5	6	0	17	21.0
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	2.5
c. Once in the Past 5 years	4	1	0	0	1	1	3	3.7
d. No Services Made Available	68	2	12	2	1	13	30	37.0
e. No Answer	97	10	1	13	5	0	29	35.8
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
14) Experiences of Supporting Services Zunde Ramambo								
a. Every Year	24	1	7	0	2	0	10	12.3
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Once in the Past 5 years	5	0	0	1	0	1	2	2.5
d. No Services Made Available	84	1	10	1	5	15	32	39.5
e. No Answer	103	12	1	18	6	0	37	45.7
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0

Note: Zunde Ramambo is to offer some amount is to offer some amount of food for drought year's community share.

Table 8 (8/29) Result of Household Survey

a. Study Area - A (continued)

Item	Overall Survey Area	No. of Households					Average/ Total	%
		Marumbe	Muchina	Makarich	Muza	Sekema		
15) Experiences of Supporting Services								
AFC and Its Loan Program								
a. Every Year	40	6	9	2	2	0	19	23.5
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	7	0	0	0	1	1	2	2.5
c. Once in the Past 5 years	18	2	0	1	0	0	3	3.7
d. No Services Made Available	82	3	8	1	5	15	32	39.5
e. No Answer	70	3	1	16	5	0	25	30.9
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
16) Experiences of Supporting Services								
COTCO/COTPRO								
a. Every Year	143	13	2	13	8	15	51	63.0
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.2
c. Once in the Past 5 years	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. No Services Made Available	32	1	14	0	2	1	18	22.2
e. No Answer	35	0	2	7	2	0	11	13.6
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
17) Experiences of Supporting Services								
ZFU								
a. Every Year	56	5	13	3	6	3	30	37.0
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.2
c. Once in the Past 5 years	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	2.5
d. No Services Made Available	72	1	4	1	2	12	20	24.7
e. No Answer	73	6	1	16	5	0	28	34.6
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
18) Experiences of Supporting Services								
Others								
a. Every Year	14	0	10	0	2	2	14	16.9
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Once in the Past 5 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. No Services Made Available	29	1	7	0	0	0	8	9.6
e. No Answer	174	13	1	20	11	16	61	73.5
Total	217	14	18	20	13	18	83	100.0
19) Major Constraints								
Poor Road								
a. Very Severe	156	14	15	18	12	5	64	79.0
b. Severe	38	0	2	1	1	9	13	16.0
c. Not Severe	5	0	0	0	0	2	2	2.5
d. No Answer	18	0	1	1	0	0	2	2.5
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
20) Major Constraints								
Medical Care								
a. Very Severe	131	8	12	4	11	13	48	59.3
b. Severe	54	5	2	12	0	3	22	27.2
c. Not Severe	9	0	1	2	0	0	3	3.7
d. No Answer	23	1	3	2	2	0	8	9.9
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
21) Major Constraints								
Poor Bridge								
a. Very Severe	109	4	8	11	8	5	36	44.4
b. Severe	44	6	1	4	0	5	16	19.8
c. Not Severe	36	0	2	2	1	6	11	13.6
d. No Answer	28	4	7	3	4	0	18	22.2
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
22) Major Constraints								
Lack of Transportation for Marketing								
a. Very Severe	90	1	14	6	8	3	32	39.5
b. Severe	56	1	3	5	1	7	17	21.0
c. Not Severe	41	0	1	5	0	6	12	14.8
d. No Answer	30	12	0	4	4	0	20	24.7
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
23) Major Constraints								
Lack of Passenger Transportation								
a. Very Severe	81	5	16	7	7	15	50	61.7
b. Severe	55	8	0	4	2	1	15	18.5
c. Not Severe	40	0	1	5	0	0	6	7.4
d. No Answer	41	1	1	4	4	0	10	12.3
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0

Table 8 (9/29) Result of Household Survey

a. Study Area - A (continued)

Item	Overall Survey Area	No. of Households					Average/Total	%
		Marumbe	Muchina	Makarich	Muza	Sekema		
24) Major Constraints								
Water for Drinking/Domestic Use								
a. Very Severe	65	3	11	8	6	5	33	40.7
b. Severe	46	9	2	6	4	6	27	33.3
c. Not Severe	60	0	2	2	1	5	10	12.3
d. No Answer	46	2	3	4	2	0	11	13.6
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
25) Major Constraints								
Water for Cropping/Gardening								
a. Very Severe	104	0	9	11	11	14	45	55.6
b. Severe	29	4	1	1	1	1	8	9.9
c. Not Severe	43	0	2	4	1	1	8	9.9
d. No Answer	41	10	6	4	0	0	20	24.7
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
26) Major Constraints								
Water for Livestock								
a. Very Severe	90	3	13	13	12	13	54	66.7
b. Severe	33	5	1	2	0	1	9	11.1
c. Not Severe	54	0	2	1	0	2	5	6.2
d. No Answer	40	6	2	4	1	0	13	16.0
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
27) Solution to Major Constraints								
Poor Road								
a. Gov. should provide the needs	48	6	8	3	4	6	27	33.3
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	105	7	6	2	6	10	31	38.3
c. Community should improve it	23	1	2	13	2	0	18	22.2
d. Attract other services	4	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.2
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. No Answer	37	0	1	2	1	0	4	4.9
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
28) Solution to Major Constraints								
Medical Care								
a. Gov. should provide the needs	48	3	9	2	2	6	22	27.2
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	113	10	1	11	7	10	39	48.1
c. Community should improve it	8	0	2	4	2	0	8	9.9
d. Attract other services	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.2
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. No Answer	47	1	5	3	2	0	11	13.6
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
29) Solution to Major Constraints								
Poor Bridge								
a. Gov. should provide the needs	50	9	7	2	4	6	28	34.6
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	74	0	1	5	3	10	19	23.5
c. Community should improve it	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	2.5
d. Attract other services	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. No Answer	84	5	10	13	4	0	32	39.5
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
30) Solution to Major Constraints								
Lack of Transportation for Marketing								
a. Gov. should provide the needs	49	1	10	2	3	5	21	25.9
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	50	0	3	2	2	11	18	22.2
c. Community should improve it	17	0	2	7	3	0	12	14.8
d. Attract other services	11	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.7
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. No Answer	87	12	2	9	4	0	27	33.3
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
31) Solution to Major Constraints								
Lack of Passenger Transportation								
a. Gov. should provide the needs	14	1	13	0	0	0	14	17.3
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	19	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.7
c. Community should improve it	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.2
d. Attract other services	104	12	0	11	9	15	47	58.0
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. No Answer	79	1	3	8	4	0	16	19.8
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0

Table 8 (10/29) Result of Household Survey

a. Study Area - A (continued)

Item	Overall Survey Area	No. of Households					Average/ Total	%
		Marumbe	Muchina	Makarich	Muza	Sekema		
32) Solution to Major Constraints								
Water for Drinking/Domestic Use								
a. Gov. should provide the needs	40	10	10	6	3	3	32	39.5
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	13	0	1	1	2	0	4	4.9
c. Community should improve it	2	0	1	0	1	0	2	2.5
d. Attract other services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	44	2	1	2	5	13	23	28.4
f. No Answer	118	2	5	11	2	0	20	24.7
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
33) Solution to Major Constraints								
Water for Cropping/Gardening								
a. Gov. should provide the needs	22	2	7	2	1	0	12	14.8
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.2
c. Community should improve it	2	0	1	1	0	0	2	2.5
d. Attract other services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	88	2	0	6	12	16	36	44.4
f. No Answer	98	10	9	11	0	0	30	37.0
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
34) Solution to Major Constraints								
Water for Livestock								
a. Gov. should provide the needs	16	1	13	1	1	0	16	19.8
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	6	1	1	1	0	0	3	3.7
c. Community should improve it	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Attract other services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	92	7	0	10	11	16	44	54.3
f. No Answer	103	5	4	8	1	0	18	22.2
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
35) Benefit of Dam/Irrigation Project								
First Reason								
a. Fishing	78	1	4	2	2	3	12	14.8
b. Cropping and gardening	75	10	9	8	6	7	40	49.4
c. Livestock watering	28	2	5	8	5	3	23	28.4
d. Water for industrial use	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	2.5
e. No answer	34	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.9
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
35) Benefit of Dam/Irrigation Project								
Second Reason								
a. Fishing	24	7	1	7	3	3	21	25.9
b. Cropping and gardening	105	3	10	6	6	8	33	40.7
c. Livestock watering	21	4	4	3	2	4	17	21.0
d. Water for industrial use	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.2
e. No answer	65	0	3	3	2	1	9	11.1
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
35) Benefit of Dam/Irrigation Project								
Third Reason								
a. Fishing	19	5	3	3	4	2	17	21.0
b. Cropping and gardening	5	0	2	1	0	1	4	4.9
c. Livestock watering	67	3	4	1	4	6	18	22.2
d. Water for industrial use	22	2	3	3	0	4	12	14.8
e. No answer	104	4	6	12	5	3	30	37.0
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
36) Effect of the Dam/Irrigation Project								
a. No effect	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Create more works	41	0	18	1	11	11	41	50.6
c. No Answer	90	14	0	19	2	5	40	49.4
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
37) Willingness to Relocation								
a. Not willing to move	86	1	13	1	0	6	21	25.9
b. Willing to move	108	13	4	19	13	10	59	72.8
c. No Answer	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.2
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0
38) Conditions of Relocation								
a. Compensation for resettlement	128	3	8	11	4	10	36	44.4
b. Social responsibility	23	7	1	3	2	0	13	16.0
c. Fear of floods and crocodiles	17	2	7	4	1	0	14	17.3
d. Aware of the Project's benefit	16	1	0	2	6	1	10	12.3
e. Self/cultural reasons	22	1	0	0	0	5	6	7.4
f. No Answer	11	0	2	0	0	0	2	2.5
Total	217	14	18	20	13	16	81	100.0

Table 8 (11/29) Result of Household Survey

b. Study Area - B

Item	No. of Households				Average/ Total	%
	Murandu	Magonyo	Hlamba	Jeffrey		
1 Human Characteristics of Household						
1) Gender of Household						
a. Male	14	17	17	13	61	80.3
b. Female	5	3	0	7	15	19.7
c. Invalid Answer	-	-	-	-	0	0.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
2) Age of the Head of Household						
Average (Years-old)	51.6	45.9	51.6	49.4	49.6	-
a. Up to 20	7	0	0	2	9	11.8
b. 21 - 30	3	2	3	3	11	14.5
c. 31 - 40	8	5	5	7	25	32.9
d. 41 - 50	0	4	2	5	11	14.5
e. 51 - 60	1	3	1	1	6	7.9
f. 61 - 70	0	4	1	1	6	7.9
g. More than 71	0	2	5	1	8	10.5
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
3) Size of Household						
Population of Interviewed Households	106	98	137	116	457	-
Average (Person/household)	5.6	4.9	8.1	5.8	6.1	-
a. 2 - 3 persons	3	9	2	4	18	23.7
b. 4 - 5 persons	6	3	3	5	17	22.4
c. 6 - 7 persons	7	3	4	6	20	26.3
d. 8 - 9 persons	1	5	3	5	14	18.4
e. More than 10	2	0	5	0	7	9.2
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
4) Level of Education (Head of H/H)						
a. No Formal Education	2	1	1	3	7	9.2
b. Drop-out of Primary School	4	4	3	2	13	17.1
c. Primary School Graduated	0	2	0	7	9	11.8
d. Drop-out of Secondary School	3	7	5	3	18	23.7
e. Secondary School Graduated	6	4	7	2	19	25.0
f. Drop-out of High School	4	1	1	3	9	11.8
g. High School Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than High School	0	0	0	0	0	-
i. No Answer	0	1	0	0	1	1.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
5) Level of Education (Overall - Male) *						
a. No Formal Education	18	11	19	12	60	25.4
b. Drop-out of Primary School	9	5	7	5	26	11.0
c. Primary School Graduated	6	8	18	7	39	16.5
d. Drop-out of Secondary School	5	8	10	9	32	13.6
e. Secondary School Graduated	7	12	15	12	46	19.5
f. Drop-out of High School	9	2	0	10	21	8.9
g. High School Graduate	3	1	1	0	5	2.1
h. More than High School	0	0	1	0	1	-
i. No Answer	0	3	3	0	6	2.5
Total	57	50	74	55	236	99.6
6) Level of Education (Overall - Female)						
a. No Formal Education	21	9	15	12	57	25.8
b. Drop-out of Primary School	4	5	7	3	19	8.6
c. Primary School Graduated	9	12	11	15	47	21.3
d. Drop-out of Secondary School	6	9	12	14	41	18.6
e. Secondary School Graduated	8	5	9	8	30	13.6
f. Drop-out of High School	1	2	1	9	13	5.9
g. High School Graduate	0	1	2	0	3	1.4
h. More than High School	0	0	0	0	0	-
i. No Answer	0	5	6	0	11	5.0
Total	49	48	63	61	221	100.0
7) Ratio of Gender Distribution (%)						
a. Male	53.8	51.0	54.0	47.4	-	51.6
b. Female	46.2	49.0	46.0	52.6	-	48.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0
8) Occupation of the Head of Household						
a. Farmer	6	8	8	6	28	36.8
b. Wage Labour	4	4	4	2	14	18.4
c. Salaried Worker	5	2	3	5	15	19.7
d. Private Business Owner	2	4	1	2	9	11.8
e. Pension Receiver	2	1	1	5	9	11.8
f. Jobless	0	1	0	0	1	1.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0

Table 8 (12/29) Result of Household Survey

b. Study Area - B (continued)

Item	No. of Households				Average/ Total	%
	Murandu	Magonyo	Hlamba	Jeffrey		
9) Occupation (Overall)						
a. Infant	21	12	13	22	68	14.9
b. School Children and Students	32	34	40	31	137	30.0
c. Farmer	31	39	58	47	175	38.3
d. Wage Labour	3	2	0	3	8	1.8
e. Salaried Worker	5	2	6	4	17	3.7
f. Pensioner	1	1	4	2	8	1.8
g. Private Business Owner	7	2	0	4	13	2.8
h. Jobless	4	3	7	1	15	3.3
i. No Answer	2	3	9	2	16	3.5
Total	106	98	137	116	457	100.0
10) Gender Distribution of Farmers						
a. Male	18	20	23	20	81	46.3
b. Female	13	19	35	27	94	53.7
Total	31	39	58	47	175	100.0
2 Economic Characteristics of Households						
1) Sources of Income - Primary						
a. Crop Sales	15	11	3	14	43	56.6
b. Livestock/Dairy Products Sales	0	0	14	1	15	19.7
c. Sales of Home Industry Products	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Salary	0	2	0	2	4	5.3
e. Wage from Temporary Job	0	2	0	3	5	6.6
f. Pension	4	5	0	0	9	11.8
g. Remittance from Family	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. Private Business	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
i. No Other Sources	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
2) Sources of Income - Secondary						
a. Crop Sales	4	8	14	3	29	38.2
b. Livestock/Dairy Products Sales	8	4	1	4	17	22.4
c. Sales of Home Industry Products	0	0	1	0	1	1.3
d. Salary	0	1	1	7	9	11.8
e. Wage from Temporary Job	4	3	0	1	8	10.5
f. Pension	3	4	0	0	7	9.2
g. Remittance from Family	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. Private Business	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
i. No Other Sources	0	0	0	5	5	6.6
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
3) Sources of Income - Tertiary						
a. Crop Sales	0	1	0	1	2	2.6
b. Livestock/Dairy Products Sales	2	3	0	2	7	9.2
c. Sales of Home Industry Products	1	1	12	0	14	18.4
d. Salary	2	2	0	1	5	6.6
e. Wage from Temporary Job	1	4	0	4	9	11.8
f. Pension	5	3	1	0	9	11.8
g. Remittance from Family	0	6	0	0	6	7.9
h. Private Business	0	0	1	0	1	1.3
i. No Other Sources	8	0	3	12	23	30.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
4) Value of Income - Primary Income (Z\$)						
Average	42,442	38,275	51,708	29,518	40,486	-
a. No Income/No Answer	0	0	0	1	1	1.3
b. Up to 10,000	4	8	5	7	24	31.6
c. 10,000 - 25,000	7	6	5	5	23	30.3
d. 25,000 - 50,000	4	2	4	5	15	19.7
e. 50,001 - 75,000	0	1	1	2	4	5.3
f. 75,001 - 100,000	1	2	0	0	3	3.9
g. 100,001 - 125,000	2	1	1	0	4	5.3
h. More than 125,000	1	0	1	0	2	2.6
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
5) Value of Income - Secondary Income (Z\$)						
Average	14,158	13,090	18,914	5,829	12,998	-
a. No Income/No Answer	8	0	0	5	13	17.1
b. Up to 10,000	5	2	6	3	16	21.1
c. 10,000 - 25,000	0	8	8	1	17	22.4
d. 25,000 - 50,000	1	4	1	1	7	9.2
e. 50,001 - 75,000	0	4	1	8	13	17.1
f. 75,001 - 100,000	2	1	1	2	6	7.9
g. 100,001 - 125,000	0	1	0	0	1	1.3
h. More than 125,000	3	0	0	0	3	3.9
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0

Table 8 (13/29) Result of Household Survey

b. Study Area - B (continued)

Item	No. of Households				Average/ Total	%
	Murandu	Magonyo	Hlamba	Jeffrey		
6) Value of Income - Tertiary Income (Z\$)						
Average	7,516	5,190	1,357	1,535	3,900	-
a. No Income/No Answer	8	6	3	12	29	38.2
b. Up to 10,000	2	3	11	1	17	22.4
c. 10,000 - 25,000	5	0	1	0	6	7.9
d. 25,000 - 50,000	2	4	0	4	10	13.2
e. 50,001 - 75,000	1	1	2	2	6	7.9
f. 75,001 - 100,000	1	5	0	1	7	9.2
g. 100,001 - 125,000	0	1	0	0	1	1.3
h. More than 125,000	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
7) Total Area of Land Holding (ha/family)						
Average (ha)	4.87	5.70	8.18	4.96	5.93	-
a. Up to 0.4 ha (Incl. Landless)	0	0	1	1	2	2.6
b. 0.4 - 2 ha	3	4	2	3	12	15.8
c. 2.1 - 4.1 ha	13	8	2	10	33	43.4
d. 4.2 - 6.2 ha	3	7	3	4	17	22.4
e. 6.3 - 8.3 ha	0	0	3	0	3	3.9
f. 8.4 - 10.3 ha	0	1	6	1	8	10.5
g. More than 10.4 ha	0	0	0	1	1	1.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
8) Area of Agricultural Land (ha/family)						
Average (ha)	4.46	4.96	7.60	4.46	5.37	-
a. Up to 0.4 ha (Incl. Landless)	0	0	1	1	2	2.6
b. 0.4 - 2 ha	3	4	2	3	12	15.8
c. 2.1 - 4.1 ha	13	10	2	10	35	46.1
d. 4.2 - 6.2 ha	3	5	4	4	16	21.1
e. 6.3 - 8.3 ha	0	0	2	0	2	2.6
f. 8.4 - 10.3 ha	0	1	6	1	8	10.5
g. More than 10.4 ha	0	0	0	1	1	1.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
9) Area of Vegetable Garden (ha/family)						
Average (ha)	0.0	0.04	0.08	0.04	0.05	-
a. Up to 0.1 ha (Incl. Landless)	18	19	11	0	48	63.2
b. 0.1 - 0.2 ha	1	1	1	16	19	25.0
c. 0.3 - 0.4 ha	0	0	4	4	8	10.5
d. 0.5 - 0.6 ha	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. 0.7 - 0.8 ha	0	0	1	0	1	1.3
f. 0.9 - 1.0 ha	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. More than 1 ha	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
10) Area of Homestead (ha/family)						
Average (ha)	0.41	0.74	0.50	0.54	0.55	-
a. Up to 0.5 ha (Incl. Landless)	2	2	4	19	27	35.5
b. 0.6 - 1.0 ha	17	11	11	1	40	52.6
c. 1.1 - 1.5 ha	0	6	1	0	7	9.2
d. 1.6 - 2.0 ha	0	0	1	0	1	1.3
e. 2.1 - 2.5 ha	0	1	0	0	1	1.3
f. 2.6 - 3.0 ha	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. More than 3 ha	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
11) Cropping Area - Cotton (ha/family)						
Average (ha)	1.90	2.06	3.30	1.71	2.24	-
a. Up to 0.4 ha	3	4	2	8	17	22.4
b. 0.4 - 2 ha	6	8	4	6	24	31.6
c. 2.1 - 4.1 ha	5	2	1	1	9	11.8
d. 4.2 - 6.2 ha	3	4	4	2	13	17.1
e. 6.3 - 8.3 ha	1	1	1	2	5	6.6
f. 8.4 - 10.3 ha	1	0	4	1	6	7.9
g. More than 10.4 ha	0	1	1	0	2	2.6
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
12) Cropping Area - Maize (ha/family)						
Average (ha)	1.12	0.97	2.23	1.36	1.42	-
a. Up to 0.4 ha	10	11	3	12	36	47.4
b. 0.4 - 2 ha	8	4	4	1	17	22.4
c. 2.1 - 4.1 ha	0	3	5	5	13	17.1
d. 4.2 - 6.2 ha	1	1	3	1	6	7.9
e. 6.3 - 8.3 ha	0	0	1	1	2	2.6
f. 8.4 - 10.3 ha	0	1	0	0	1	1.3
g. More than 10.4 ha	0	0	1	0	1	1.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0

Table 8 (14/29) Result of Household Survey

b. Study Area - B (continued)

Item	No. of Households				Average/ Total	%
	Murandu	Magonyo	Hlamba	Jeffrey		
13) Cropping Area - Groundnuts (ha/family)						
Average	0.42	0.31	0.48	0.31	0.38	-
a. Up to 0.4 ha	2	6	3	11	22	28.9
b. 0.4 - 2 ha	0	1	1	1	3	3.9
c. 2.1 - 4.1 ha	1	5	2	4	12	15.8
d. 4.2 - 6.2 ha	11	6	6	2	25	32.9
e. 6.3 - 8.3 ha	2	1	0	0	3	3.9
f. 8.4 - 10.3 ha	3	1	2	2	8	10.5
g. More than 10.4 ha	0	0	3	0	3	3.9
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
14) Crop Production - Cotton						
Average (bale/family)**	10.8	10.2	29.0	7.7	14.4	-
a. No Answer	2	2	13	4	21	27.6
b. Up to 5 bales	4	1	1	3	9	11.8
c. 6 - 10 bales	5	8	0	7	20	26.3
d. 11 - 15 bales	2	3	0	2	7	9.2
e. 16 - 20 bales	3	3	1	3	10	13.2
f. 21 - 25 bales	3	3	1	1	8	10.5
g. 25 - 30 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 30 bales	0	0	1	0	1	1.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
15) Crop Production - Maize						
Average (bale/family)**	29.1	16.5	6.75	21.15	18.4	-
a. No Answer	1	13	13	1	28	36.8
b. Up to 10 bales	0	0	1	1	2	2.6
c. 11 - 20 bales	2	1	1	3	7	9.2
d. 21 - 30 bales	0	1	0	1	2	2.6
e. 31 - 40 bales	3	4	2	0	9	11.8
f. 41 - 50 bales	8	1	0	11	20	26.3
g. 51 - 60 bales	5	0	0	1	6	7.9
h. More than 60 bales	0	0	0	2	2	2.6
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
16) Crop Production - Groundnuts						
Average (bale/family)**	6.65	7.6	0	7.95	5.6	-
a. No Answer	4	7	17	10	38	50.0
b. Up to 10 bales	4	3	0	2	9	11.8
c. 11 - 20 bales	4	1	0	1	6	7.9
d. 21 - 30 bales	2	2	0	0	4	5.3
e. 31 - 40 bales	2	4	0	1	7	9.2
f. 41 - 50 bales	2	2	0	2	6	7.9
g. 51 - 60 bales	1	1	0	4	6	7.9
h. More than 60 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
17) Home Consumption - Cotton						
Average(bale/family)**	0.2	0	0	7.0	1.8	-
a. No Consumption	19	20	17	19	75	98.7
b. Up to 5 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. 6 - 10 bales	0	0	0	1	1	1.3
d. 11 - 15 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. 16 - 20 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. 21 - 25 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. 25 - 30 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 30 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
18) Home Consumption - Maize						
Average (bale/family)**	20.6	14.1	0	14.05	12.2	-
a. No Consumption	1	0	17	4	22	28.9
b. Up to 10 bales	3	6	0	2	11	14.5
c. 11 - 20 bales	5	6	0	2	13	17.1
d. 21 - 30 bales	4	6	0	1	11	14.5
e. 31 - 40 bales	2	1	0	3	6	7.9
f. 41 - 50 bales	1	0	0	5	6	7.9
g. 51 - 60 bales	3	1	0	3	7	9.2
h. More than 60 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0

Note: ** - 1 bale = 50 kg

Table 8 (15/29) Result of Household Survey

b. Study Area - B (continued)

Item	No. of Households				Average/ Total	%
	Murandu	Magonyo	Hlamba	Jeffrey		
19) Home Consumption - Groundnuts						
Average(bale/family)**	6.4	3.2	0	8.5	4.5	-
a. No Consumption	1	6	17	17	41	53.9
b. Up to 10 bales	2	3	0	2	7	9.2
c. 11 - 20 bales	6	4	0	0	10	13.2
d. 21 - 30 bales	3	3	0	0	6	7.9
e. 31 - 40 bales	3	3	0	1	7	9.2
f. 41 - 50 bales	1	1	0	0	2	2.6
g. 51 - 60 bales	3	0	0	0	3	3.9
h. More than 60 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
20) Debt/Rent Exchange - Cotton						
Average (bale/family)**	0	0	0	0	0.0	-
a. No Exchange	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
b. Up to 5 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. 6 - 10 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. 11 - 15 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. 16 - 20 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. 21 - 25 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. 25 - 30 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 30 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
21) Debt/Rent Exchange - Maize						
Average (bale/family)**	2.5	4.5	0	0	1.8	-
a. No Exchange	17	8	17	20	62	81.6
b. Up to 10 bales	0	6	0	0	6	7.9
c. 11 - 20 bales	1	1	0	0	2	2.6
d. 21 - 30 bales	1	2	0	0	3	3.9
e. 31 - 40 bales	0	1	0	0	1	1.3
f. 41 - 50 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. 51 - 60 bales	0	1	0	0	1	1.3
h. More than 60 bales	0	1	0	0	1	1.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
22) Debt/Rent Exchange - Groundnuts						
Average (bale/family)**	2.0	1.7	0	0	0.9	-
a. No Exchange	18	11	17	20	66	86.8
b. Up to 10 bales	1	6	0	0	7	9.2
c. 11 - 20 bales	0	3	0	0	3	3.9
d. 21 - 30 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. 31 - 40 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. 41 - 50 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. 51 - 60 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 60 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
23) Marketing Practice - Cotton						
a. Locally Marketed	0	4	0	1	5	6.6
b. Sold to Nearest Villages	17	13	0	1	31	40.8
c. Sold to Gokwe/Sanyati	0	0	0	15	15	19.7
d. Sold to Private Dealers	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Sold to Grain Marketing Board	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. Contract Secured for Sale	0	0	0	2	2	2.6
g. No Answer/Invalid Answer	2	3	17	1	23	30.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
24) Marketing Practice - Maize						
a. Locally Marketed	0	4	0	5	9	11.8
b. Sold to Nearest Villages	1	1	0	0	2	2.6
c. Sold to Gokwe/Sanyati	0	0	0	1	1	1.3
d. Sold to Private Dealers	2	0	0	3	5	6.6
e. Sold to Grain Marketing Board	0	7	0	0	7	9.2
f. Contract Secured for Sale	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. No Answer/Invalid Answer	16	8	17	11	52	68.4
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
25) Marketing Practice - Groundnuts						
a. Locally Marketed	0	1	0	1	2	2.6
b. Sold to Nearest Villages	1	0	0	0	1	1.3
c. Sold to Gokwe/Sanyati	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Sold to Private Dealers	1	1	0	1	3	3.9
e. Sold to Grain Marketing Board	1	4	0	1	6	7.9
f. Contract Secured for Sale	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. No Answer/Invalid Answer	16	14	17	17	64	84.2
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0

Table 8 (16/29) Result of Household Survey

b. Study Area - B (continued)

Item	No. of Households				Average/ Total	%
	Murandu	Magonyo	Hlamba	Jeffrey		
26) Damages to Farming Area - Drought						
Average Damaged Area (ha)	2.4	4.8	0.0	1.8	2.2	-
a. Once in the Past	0	2	0	3	5	6.6
b. Occasionally	17	16	0	15	48	63.2
c. Regularly	1	0	0	0	1	1.3
d. None	1	2	17	2	22	28.9
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
27) Damages to Farming Area - Gully Erosion						
Average Damaged Area (ha)	2.3	15.0	0.0	4.0	5.325	-
a. Once in the Past	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Occasionally	3	1	0	13	17	22.4
c. Regularly	4	0	0	2	6	7.9
d. None	12	19	17	5	53	69.7
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
28) Damages to Farming Area - Sheet Erosion						
Average Damaged Area (ha)	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	-
a. Once in the Past	3	0	0	0	3	3.9
b. Occasionally	1	0	0	0	1	1.3
c. Regularly	3	0	0	0	3	3.9
d. None	12	20	17	20	69	90.8
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
29) Average Annual Expenditure (ZS/family)						
a. Food	16,832	20,219	No Answer	7,595	11,162	59.1
b. Clothing	22,632	14,269	No Answer	5,740	10,660	56.4
c. Education	6,311	5,351	No Answer	2,193	3,464	18.3
d. Farming Input	1,682	2,050	No Answer	787	1,130	6.0
e. Others	10,921	1,175	No Answer	2,430	3,632	19.2
Total	58,378	43,064	0	18,745	18,885	100.0
3 Socio-economic Characteristics of Households						
1) Title Holder of Land						
a. Husband	14	19	17	19	69	90.8
b. Wife	4	0	0	0	4	5.3
c. Husband's Father	0	0	0	1	1	1.3
d. Husband's Mother	0	1	0	0	1	1.3
e. Wife's Father	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. Wife's Mother	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. Not Registered	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. Unknown	1	0	0	0	1	1.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
2) Reliability of Water Resources-River						
a. Permanently Available	0	0	3	2	5	6.6
b. Seasonally Available	11	0	1	18	30	39.5
c. Timely Available/Maintained	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Available at Random	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Not Available	8	20	13	0	41	53.9
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
3) Reliability of Water Resources - Well						
a. Permanently Available	0	12	2	2	16	21.1
b. Seasonally Available	1	7	0	4	12	15.8
c. Timely Available/Maintained	18	0	0	0	18	23.7
d. Available at Random	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Not Available	0	1	15	14	30	39.5
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
4) Reliability of Water Resources - Borehole						
a. Permanently Available	0	1	4	1	6	7.9
b. Seasonally Available	0	0	1	0	1	1.3
c. Timely Available/Maintained	0	0	4	2	6	7.9
d. Available at Random	2	6	4	13	25	32.9
e. Not Available	17	13	4	4	38	50.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
5) Reliability of Water Resources - Others						
a. Permanently Available	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Seasonally Available	1	0	0	0	1	1.3
c. Timely Available/Maintained	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Available at Random	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Not Available	18	20	17	20	75	98.7
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0

Table 8 (17/29) Result of Household Survey

b. Study Area - B (continued)

Item	No. of Households				Average/ Total	%
	Murandu	Magonyo	Hlamba	Jeffrey		
6) Use of Water Resources - River						
a. Drinking/Domestic Use	4	0	1	2	7	9.2
b. Fishing	0	0	1	0	1	1.3
c. Watering Crops	0	0	1	0	1	1.3
d. Livestock	6	0	0	0	6	7.9
e. No Answer	9	20	14	18	61	80.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
7) Use of Water Resources - Well						
a. Drinking/Domestic Use	19	13	2	6	40	52.6
b. Fishing	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Watering Crops	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. No Answer	0	7	15	14	36	47.4
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
8) Use of Water Resources - Borehole						
a. Drinking/Domestic Use	1	6	11	18	36	47.4
b. Fishing	0	0	1	0	1	1.3
c. Watering Crops	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Livestock	0	1	0	0	1	1.3
e. No Answer	18	13	5	2	38	50.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
9) Use of Water Resources - Others						
a. Drinking/Domestic Use	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Fishing	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Watering Crops	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. No Answer	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
10) Experiences of Supporting Services AGRITEX						
a. Every Year	3	0	0	10	13	17.1
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	1	1	0	2	4	5.3
c. Once in the Past 5 years	1	1	0	2	4	5.3
d. No Services Made Available	13	0	2	5	20	26.3
e. No Answer	1	18	15	1	35	46.1
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
11) Experiences of Supporting Services Veterinary Services						
a. Every Year	14	11	1	16	42	55.3
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	1	2	0	2	5	6.6
c. Once in the Past 5 years	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. No Services Made Available	4	7	0	2	13	17.1
e. No Answer	0	0	16	0	16	21.1
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
12) Experiences of Supporting Services NGOs						
a. Every Year	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	0	1	0	2	3	3.9
c. Once in the Past 5 years	4	0	0	12	16	21.1
d. No Services Made Available	14	19	0	5	38	50.0
e. No Answer	1	0	17	1	19	25.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
13) Experiences of Supporting Services Munyati Cooperative						
a. Every Year	13	4	0	0	17	22.4
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	2	0	0	0	2	2.6
c. Once in the Past 5 years	0	0	0	1	1	1.3
d. No Services Made Available	3	16	0	18	37	48.7
e. No Answer	1	0	17	1	19	25.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
14) Experiences of Supporting Services Zunde Ramambo						
a. Every Year	1	0	0	0	1	1.3
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	1	0	0	0	1	1.3
c. Once in the Past 5 years	2	0	0	1	3	3.9
d. No Services Made Available	13	20	0	18	51	67.1
e. No Answer	2	0	17	1	20	26.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0

Note: Zunde Ramambo is to offer some amount is to offer some amount of food for drought year's community share.

Table 8 (18/29) Result of Household Survey

b. Study Area - B (continued)

Item	No. of Households				Average/ Total	%
	Murandu	Magonyo	Hlamba	Jeffrey		
15) Experiences of Supporting Services						
AFC and Its Loan Program						
a. Every Year	2	0	0	2	4	5.3
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	4	0	0	1	5	6.6
c. Once in the Past 5 years	1	1	0	0	2	2.6
d. No Services Made Available	11	19	0	16	46	60.5
e. No Answer	1	0	17	1	19	25.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
16) Experiences of Supporting Services						
COTCO/COTPRO						
a. Every Year	15	17	0	10	42	55.3
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	2	0	0	1	3	3.9
c. Once in the Past 5 years	0	1	0	1	2	2.6
d. No Services Made Available	1	2	0	8	11	14.5
e. No Answer	1	0	17	0	18	23.7
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
17) Experiences of Supporting Services						
ZFU						
a. Every Year	7	1	0	0	8	10.5
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	3	0	0	3	6	7.9
c. Once in the Past 5 years	4	0	0	0	4	5.3
d. No Services Made Available	4	19	0	16	39	51.3
e. No Answer	1	0	17	1	19	25.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
18) Experiences of Supporting Services						
Others						
a. Every Year	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Once in the Past 5 years	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. No Services Made Available	0	0	0	18	18	23.7
e. No Answer	19	20	17	2	58	76.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
19) Major Constraints						
Poor Road						
a. Very Severe	19	12	15	18	64	84.2
b. Severe	0	8	2	1	11	14.5
c. Not Severe	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. No Answer	0	0	0	1	1	1.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
20) Major Constraints						
Medical Care						
a. Very Severe	12	9	17	15	53	69.7
b. Severe	6	7	0	5	18	23.7
c. Not Severe	1	1	0	0	2	2.6
d. No Answer	0	3	0	0	3	3.9
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
21) Major Constraints						
Poor Bridge						
a. Very Severe	16	12	13	12	53	69.7
b. Severe	2	6	3	7	18	23.7
c. Not Severe	1	2	0	1	4	5.3
d. No Answer	0	0	1	0	1	1.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
22) Major Constraints						
Lack of Transportation for Marketing						
a. Very Severe	12	1	6	3	22	28.9
b. Severe	2	5	7	15	29	38.2
c. Not Severe	0	14	3	2	19	25.0
d. No Answer	5	0	1	0	6	7.9
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
23) Major Constraints						
Lack of Passenger Transportation						
a. Very Severe	18	0	9	4	31	40.8
b. Severe	0	7	3	16	26	34.2
c. Not Severe	1	13	1	0	15	19.7
d. No Answer	0	0	4	0	4	5.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0

Table 8 (19/29) Result of Household Survey

b. Study Area - B (continued)

Item	No. of Households				Average/ Total	%
	Murandu	Magonyo	Hlamba	Jeffrey		
24) Major Constraints						
Water for Drinking/Domestic Use						
a. Very Severe	4	7	3	15	29	38.2
b. Severe	2	8	3	4	17	22.4
c. Not Severe	13	5	7	1	26	34.2
d. No Answer	0	0	4	0	4	5.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
25) Major Constraints						
Water for Cropping/Gardening						
a. Very Severe	5	13	4	18	40	52.6
b. Severe	4	6	4	2	16	21.1
c. Not Severe	10	1	4	0	15	19.7
d. No Answer	0	0	5	0	5	6.6
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
26) Major Constraints						
Water for Livestock						
a. Very Severe	5	5	3	13	26	34.2
b. Severe	1	10	3	6	20	26.3
c. Not Severe	13	5	6	1	25	32.9
d. No Answer	0	0	5	0	5	6.6
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
27) Solution to Major Constraints						
Poor Road						
a. Gov. should provide the needs	2	5	0	8	15	19.7
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	15	14	0	8	37	48.7
c. Community should improve it	2	0	0	3	5	6.6
d. Attract other services	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. No Answer	0	1	17	1	19	25.0
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
28) Solution to Major Constraints						
Medical Care						
a. Gov. should provide the needs	2	2	0	6	10	13.2
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	16	13	0	14	43	56.6
c. Community should improve it	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Attract other services	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. No Answer	1	5	17	0	23	30.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
29) Solution to Major Constraints						
Poor Bridge						
a. Gov. should provide the needs	8	4	0	7	19	25.0
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	10	10	0	12	32	42.1
c. Community should improve it	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Attract other services	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. No Answer	1	6	17	1	25	32.9
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
30) Solution to Major Constraints						
Lack of Transportation for Marketing						
a. Gov. should provide the needs	2	0	0	2	4	5.3
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	10	2	0	10	22	28.9
c. Community should improve it	1	0	0	4	5	6.6
d. Attract other services	2	0	0	1	3	3.9
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	0	0	0	3	3	3.9
f. No Answer	4	18	17	0	39	51.3
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
31) Solution to Major Constraints						
Lack of Passenger Transportation						
a. Gov. should provide the needs	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	1	1	0	0	2	2.6
c. Community should improve it	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Attract other services	18	0	0	20	38	50.0
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. No Answer	0	19	17	0	36	47.4
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0

Table 8 (20/29) Result of Household Survey

b. Study Area - B (continued)

Item	No. of Households				Average/ Total	%
	Murandu	Magonyo	Hlamba	Jeffrey		
32) Solution to Major Constraints						
Water for Drinking/Domestic Use						
a. Gov. should provide the needs	1	0	0	7	8	10.5
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	3	0	0	4	7	9.2
c. Community should improve it	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Attract other services	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	1	1	0	9	11	14.5
f. No Answer	14	19	17	0	50	65.8
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
33) Solution to Major Constraints						
Water for Cropping/Gardening						
a. Gov. should provide the needs	0	0	0	1	1	1.3
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Community should improve it	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Attract other services	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	8	2	0	19	29	38.2
f. No Answer	11	18	17	0	46	60.5
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
34) Solution to Major Constraints						
Water for Livestock						
a. Gov. should provide the needs	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	0	0	0	1	1	1.3
c. Community should improve it	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Attract other services	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	6	2	0	19	27	35.5
f. No Answer	13	18	17	0	48	63.2
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
35) Benefit of Dam/Irrigation Project						
First Reason						
a. Fishing	2	7	0	15	24	31.6
b. Cropping and gardening	9	8	0	3	20	26.3
c. Livestock watering	3	0	0	1	4	5.3
d. Water for industrial use	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. No answer	5	5	17	1	28	36.8
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
35) Benefit of Dam/Irrigation Project						
Second Reason						
a. Fishing	1	0	0	2	3	3.9
b. Cropping and gardening	4	7	0	12	23	30.3
c. Livestock watering	1	1	0	2	4	5.3
d. Water for industrial use	1	0	0	0	1	1.3
e. No answer	12	12	17	4	45	59.2
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
35) Benefit of Dam/Irrigation Project						
Third Reason						
a. Fishing	0	0	0	1	1	1.3
b. Cropping and gardening	0	0	0	1	1	1.3
c. Livestock watering	0	3	0	10	13	17.1
d. Water for industrial use	1	0	0	0	1	1.3
e. No answer	18	17	17	8	60	78.9
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
36) Effect of the Dam/Irrigation Project						
a. No effect	11	13	0	17	41	53.9
b. Create more works	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. No Answer	8	7	17	3	35	46.1
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
37) Willingness to Relocation						
a. Not willing to move	8	0	4	3	15	19.7
b. Willing to move	11	11	10	17	49	64.5
c. No Answer	0	9	3	0	12	15.8
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0
38) Conditions of Relocation						
a. Compensation for resettlement	13	8	9	15	45	59.2
b. Social responsibility	1	3	1	1	6	7.9
c. Fear of floods and crocodiles	0	3	0	0	3	3.9
d. Aware of the Project's benefit	1	1	0	2	4	5.3
e. Self/cultural reasons	3	2	2	2	9	11.8
f. No Answer	1	3	5	0	9	11.8
Total	19	20	17	20	76	100.0

Table 8 (21/29) Result of Household Survey

c. Study Area - C

Item	No. of Households						Average/ Total	%
	Gunde	Komboni	Mahvondo	Mateuro	Mujibeki	Mabharani		
1 Human Characteristics of Household								
1) Gender of Household								
a. Male	4	9	5	9	9	8	44	73.3
b. Female	6	1	5	1	1	2	16	26.7
c. Invalid Answer	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
2) Age of the Head of Household								
Average (Years-old)	51.0	48.0	38.0	49.4	39.0	64.0	48.2	-
a. Up to 20	0	1	4	3	3	0	11	18.3
b. 21 - 30	2	3	2	2	2	0	11	18.3
c. 31 - 40	3	2	3	4	4	1	17	28.3
d. 41 - 50	4	2	0	1	1	3	11	18.3
e. 51 - 60	1	2	0	0	0	5	8	13.3
f. 61 - 70	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.7
g. More than 71	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
3) Size of Household								
Population of Interviewed Households	84	72	49	89	38	62	394	-
Average (Person/household)	8.4	7.2	4.9	8.9	3.8	6.2	6.6	-
a. 2 - 3 persons	2	1	2	1	3	2	11	18.3
b. 4 - 5 persons	0	3	4	4	5	2	18	30.0
c. 6 - 7 persons	4	2	3	0	2	3	14	23.3
d. 8 - 9 persons	1	3	0	2	0	0	6	10.0
e. More than 10	3	1	1	3	0	3	11	18.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
4) Level of Education (Head of H/H)								
a. No Formal Education	3	2	1	3	3	3	15	25.0
b. Drop-out of Primary School	1	1	2	0	2	4	10	16.7
c. Primary School Graduated	0	1	0	4	0	1	6	10.0
d. Drop-out of Secondary School	1	3	1	2	2	1	10	16.7
e. Secondary School Graduated	1	1	5	1	1	1	10	16.7
f. Drop-out of High School	4	1	1	0	2	0	8	13.3
g. High School Graduate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than High School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
i. No Answer	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
5) Level of Education (Overall - Male)								
a. No Formal Education	7	11	4	12	8	11	53	25.7
b. Drop-out of Primary School	4	2	5	7	3	5	26	12.6
c. Primary School Graduated	2	5	3	7	4	7	28	13.6
d. Drop-out of Secondary School	12	4	7	6	3	3	35	17.0
e. Secondary School Graduated	6	6	4	7	1	2	26	12.6
f. Drop-out of High School	8	7	2	3	0	3	23	11.2
g. High School Graduate	6	3	0	4	1	1	15	7.3
h. More than High School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
i. No Answer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	45	38	25	46	20	32	206	100.0
6) Level of Education (Overall - Female)								
a. No Formal Education	10	9	5	12	5	7	48	25.5
b. Drop-out of Primary School	6	5	7	3	1	3	25	13.3
c. Primary School Graduated	3	7	3	7	3	7	30	16.0
d. Drop-out of Secondary School	7	6	2	4	4	6	29	15.4
e. Secondary School Graduated	6	3	3	8	2	4	26	13.8
f. Drop-out of High School	7	3	1	9	1	2	23	12.2
g. High School Graduate	0	1	3	0	2	1	7	3.7
h. More than High School	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
i. No Answer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	39	34	24	43	18	30	188	100.0
7) Ratio of Gender Distribution (%)								
a. Male	53.6	52.8	51.0	51.7	52.6	51.6	-	52.3
b. Female	46.4	47.2	49.0	48.3	47.4	48.4	-	47.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	100.0
8) Occupation of the Head of Household								
a. Farmer	8	9	8	8	6	7	46	76.7
b. Wage Labour	2	0	2	2	2	2	10	16.7
c. Salaried Worker	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	5.0
d. Private Business Owner	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.7
e. Pension Receiver	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. Jobless	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
9) Occupation (Overall)								
a. Infant	9	3	5	8	7	8	40	10.2
b. School Children and Students	13	14	9	11	6	8	61	15.5
c. Farmer	49	45	24	51	16	37	222	56.3
d. Wage Labour	1	2	0	6	0	2	11	2.8
e. Salaried Worker	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	0.8
f. Pensioner	4	0	1	2	1	2	10	2.5
g. Private Business Owner	0	1	0	3	0	0	4	1.0
h. Jobless	8	7	10	8	6	4	43	10.9
i. No Answer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	84	72	49	89	38	62	394	100.0

Table 8 (22/29) Result of Household Survey

c. Study Area - C (continued)

Item	No. of Households						Average/ Total	%
	Gunde	Komboni	Mabvondo	Mateuro	Mujubeki	Mabharani		
10) Gender Distribution of Farmers								
a. Male	22	20	11	22	6	12	93	41.9
b. Female	27	25	13	29	10	25	129	58.1
Total	49	45	24	51	16	37	222	100.0
2) Economic Characteristics of Households								
1) Sources of Income - Primary								
a. Crop Sales	9	9	10	10	9	10	57	95.0
b. Livestock/Dairy Products Sales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Sales of Home Industry Products	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Salary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Wage from Temporary Job	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	3.3
f. Pension	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. Remittance from Family	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. Private Business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
i. No Other Sources	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
2) Sources of Income - Secondary								
a. Crop Sales	1	1	10	0	0	0	12	20.0
b. Livestock/Dairy Products Sales	5	4	0	1	0	1	11	18.3
c. Sales of Home Industry Products	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Salary	1	0	0	1	2	1	5	8.3
e. Wage from Temporary Job	0	1	0	1	3	2	7	11.7
f. Pension	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. Remittance from Family	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. Private Business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
i. No Other Sources	3	4	0	7	5	6	25	41.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
3) Sources of Income - Tertiary								
a. Crop Sales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Livestock/Dairy Products Sales	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7
c. Sales of Home Industry Products	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Salary	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7
e. Wage from Temporary Job	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7
f. Pension	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. Remittance from Family	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. Private Business	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
i. No Other Sources	7	10	10	10	10	10	57	95.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
4) Value of Income - Primary Income (Z\$)								
Average	32,500	28,744	60,300	38,360	22,930	51,000	38,972	-
a. No Income/No Answer	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.7
b. Up to 10,000	1	1	0	1	0	1	4	6.7
c. 10,000 - 25,000	1	0	0	0	3	1	5	8.3
d. 25,000 - 50,000	2	5	1	2	4	3	17	28.3
e. 50,001 - 75,000	4	2	6	5	1	3	21	35.0
f. 75,001 - 100,000	2	2	0	0	0	2	6	10.0
g. 100,001 - 125,000	0	0	2	1	1	0	4	6.7
h. More than 125,000	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
5) Value of Income - Secondary Income (Z\$)								
Average	15,671	0	0	0	9,600	23,750	16,340	-
a. No Income/No Answer	3	10	10	10	5	6	44	73.3
b. Up to 10,000	2	0	0	0	4	0	6	10.0
c. 10,000 - 25,000	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	6.7
d. 25,000 - 50,000	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	3.3
e. 50,001 - 75,000	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	6.7
f. 75,001 - 100,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. 100,001 - 125,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 125,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
6) Value of Income - Tertiary Income (Z\$)								
Average	14,300	0	0	0	0	0	14,300	-
a. No Income/No Answer	7	10	10	10	10	10	57	95.0
b. Up to 10,000	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.3
c. 10,000 - 25,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. 25,000 - 50,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. 50,001 - 75,000	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7
f. 75,001 - 100,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. 100,001 - 125,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 125,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
7) Total Area of Land Holding (ha/family)								
Average (ha)	5.41	3.72	5.53	5.04	3.06	3.84	4.43	-
a. Up to 0.4 ha (Incl. Landless)	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.7
b. 0.4 - 2 ha	3	6	0	3	2	3	17	28.3
c. 2.1 - 4.1 ha	3	4	4	5	5	3	24	40.0
d. 4.2 - 6.2 ha	3	0	5	1	1	2	12	20.0
e. 6.3 - 8.3 ha	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. 8.4 - 10.3 ha	1	0	1	1	0	2	5	8.3
g. More than 10.4 ha	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0

Table 8 (23/29) Result of Household Survey

c. Study Area - C (continued)

Item	No. of Households						Average/ Total	%
	Gunde	Komboni	Mahvondo	Mateuro	Mujubeki	Mabharani		
8) Area of Agricultural Land (ha/family)								
Average (ha)	4.67	3.35	2.60	4.30	1.61	2.89	3.24	-
a. Up to 0.4 ha (Incl. Landless)	1	0	1	1	1	0	4	6.7
b. 0.4 - 2 ha	2	7	7	1	7	4	28	46.7
c. 2.1 - 4.1 ha	5	3	2	1	1	3	15	25.0
d. 4.2 - 6.2 ha	1	0	0	6	1	2	10	16.7
e. 6.3 - 8.3 ha	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7
f. 8.4 - 10.3 ha	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.7
g. More than 10.4 ha	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
9) Area of Vegetable Garden (ha/family)								
Average (ha)	0.3	0.54	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.32	-
a. Up to 0.1 ha (Incl. Landless)	3	0	8	10	10	10	41	68.3
b. 0.1 - 0.2 ha	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.3
c. 0.3 - 0.4 ha	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7
d. 0.5 - 0.6 ha	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
e. 0.7 - 0.8 ha	0	10	0	0	0	0	10	16.7
f. 0.9 - 1.0 ha	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
g. More than 1 ha	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
10) Area of Homestead (ha/family)								
Average (ha)	0.50	0.45	0.66	0.54	0.37	1.78	0.72	-
a. Up to 0.5 ha (Incl. Landless)	2	0	0	1	1	7	11	18.3
b. 0.6 - 1.0 ha	6	9	4	7	2	0	28	46.7
c. 1.1 - 1.5 ha	2	1	6	1	7	1	18	30.0
d. 1.6 - 2.0 ha	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	3.3
e. 2.1 - 2.5 ha	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. 2.6 - 3.0 ha	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. More than 3 ha	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
11) Cropping Area - Cotton (ha/family)								
Average (ha)	2.93	1.71	2.21	3.15	1.15	1.16	2.05	-
a. Up to 0.4 ha	1	1	1	0	2	2	7	11.7
b. 0.4 - 2 ha	0	7	6	3	7	1	24	40.0
c. 2.1 - 4.1 ha	1	2	1	0	0	5	9	15.0
d. 4.2 - 6.2 ha	4	0	2	2	0	1	9	15.0
e. 6.3 - 8.3 ha	1	0	0	4	1	1	7	11.7
f. 8.4 - 10.3 ha	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	3.3
g. More than 10.4 ha	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
12) Cropping Area - Maize (ha/family)								
Average (ha)	1.80	1.69	0.97	0.56	0.56	0.85	1.07	-
a. Up to 0.4 ha	1	3	1	2	3	4	14	23.3
b. 0.4 - 2 ha	1	0	5	4	3	3	16	26.7
c. 2.1 - 4.1 ha	3	1	4	3	4	3	18	30.0
d. 4.2 - 6.2 ha	1	3	0	1	0	0	5	8.3
e. 6.3 - 8.3 ha	2	3	0	0	0	0	5	8.3
f. 8.4 - 10.3 ha	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. More than 10.4 ha	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
13) Cropping Area - Groundnuts (ha/family)								
Average	0.66	0.45	0.49	0.45	0.56	0.41	0.50	-
a. Up to 0.4 ha	4	6	5	3	4	6	28	46.7
b. 0.4 - 2 ha	0	2	4	1	1	0	8	13.3
c. 2.1 - 4.1 ha	0	1	1	3	4	0	9	15.0
d. 4.2 - 6.2 ha	0	1	0	2	0	4	7	11.7
e. 6.3 - 8.3 ha	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	8.3
f. 8.4 - 10.3 ha	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.7
g. More than 10.4 ha	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
14) Crop Production - Cotton								
Average (bale/family)**	14.7	17.5	8.0	9.4	7.8	24.0	13.6	-
a. No Answer	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	11.7
b. Up to 5 bales	7	9	2	9	1	6	34	56.7
c. 6 - 10 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. 11 - 15 bales	2	1	0	1	3	0	7	11.7
e. 16 - 20 bales	1	0	3	0	1	0	5	8.3
f. 21 - 25 bales	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.7
g. 25 - 30 bales	0	0	5	0	1	0	6	10.0
h. More than 30 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
15) Crop Production - Maize								
Average (bale/family)**	60.2	26.2	21.3	35.7	13.2	45.0	35.9	-
a. No Answer	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.3
b. Up to 10 bales	4	0	0	1	2	1	8	13.3
c. 11 - 20 bales	0	1	3	0	2	0	6	10.0
d. 21 - 30 bales	1	3	3	1	4	0	12	20.0
e. 31 - 40 bales	2	5	3	0	1	4	15	25.0
f. 41 - 50 bales	1	1	1	3	0	3	9	15.0

Note: ** - 1 bale = 50 kg

Table 8 (24/29) Result of Household Survey

c. Study Area - C (continued)

Item	No. of Households						Average/ Total	%
	Gunde	Komboni	Mahvondo	Mateuro	Mujubeki	Mabharani		
g. 51 - 60 bales	2	0	0	3	0	2	7	11.7
h. More than 60 bales	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
16) Crop Production - Groundnuts								
Average (bale/family)**	16.8	14.5	10.2	11.0	10.5	13.4	12.7	-
a. No Answer	4	4	1	3	4	5	21	35.0
b. Up to 10 bales	2	3	5	3	4	2	19	31.7
c. 11 - 20 bales	2	1	3	3	1	1	11	18.3
d. 21 - 30 bales	1	2	1	1	1	2	8	13.3
e. 31 - 40 bales	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7
f. 41 - 50 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. 51 - 60 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 60 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
17) Home Consumption - Cotton								
Average(bale/family)**	0.0	0.0	4.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	-
a. No Consumption	10	10	9	6	10	10	55	91.7
b. Up to 5 bales	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.7
c. 6 - 10 bales	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.7
d. 11 - 15 bales	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.3
e. 16 - 20 bales	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.7
f. 21 - 25 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. 25 - 30 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 30 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
18) Home Consumption - Maize								
Average (bale/family)**	18.1	18.1	16.5	17.5	15.8	34.8	20.1	-
a. No Consumption	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	5.0
b. Up to 10 bales	2	1	1	0	2	0	6	10.0
c. 11 - 20 bales	1	3	3	4	3	0	14	23.3
d. 21 - 30 bales	4	3	4	4	2	1	18	30.0
e. 31 - 40 bales	1	2	2	1	1	3	10	16.7
f. 41 - 50 bales	0	1	0	1	0	3	5	8.3
g. 51 - 60 bales	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	6.7
h. More than 60 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
19) Home Consumption - Groundnuts								
Average(bale/family)**	8.8	12.0	6.0	7.9	5.8	10.5	8.5	-
a. No Consumption	4	5	1	3	5	6	24	40.0
b. Up to 10 bales	4	3	6	5	5	2	25	41.7
c. 11 - 20 bales	1	0	3	1	0	1	6	10.0
d. 21 - 30 bales	1	2	0	1	0	1	5	8.3
e. 31 - 40 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. 41 - 50 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. 51 - 60 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 60 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
20) Debt/Rent Exchange - Cotton								
Average (bale/family)**	0	0	1.3	0	0	0	1.3	-
a. No Exchange	10	10	7	10	10	10	57	95.0
b. Up to 5 bales	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.3
c. 6 - 10 bales	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.7
d. 11 - 15 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. 16 - 20 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. 21 - 25 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. 25 - 30 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 30 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
21) Debt/Rent Exchange - Maize								
Average (bale/family)**	2.8	0	2.67	0	0	0	2.7	-
a. No Exchange	0	10	7	10	10	10	47	78.3
b. Up to 10 bales	6	0	1	0	0	0	7	11.7
c. 11 - 20 bales	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	5.0
d. 21 - 30 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. 31 - 40 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. 41 - 50 bales	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.3
g. 51 - 60 bales	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7
h. More than 60 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
22) Debt/Rent Exchange - Groundnuts								
Average (bale/family)**	0.0	0	2.2	3.0	0	0	2.6	-
a. No Exchange	10	10	5	7	10	10	52	86.7
b. Up to 10 bales	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.3
c. 11 - 20 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. 21 - 30 bales	0	0	3	3	0	0	6	10.0
e. 31 - 40 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. 41 - 50 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. 51 - 60 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. More than 60 bales	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0

Table 8 (25/29) Result of Household Survey

c. Study Area - C (continued)

Item	No. of Households						Average/ Total	%
	Gunde	Komboni	Mahvondo	Mateuro	Majubeki	Mabharani		
23) Marketing Practice - Cotton								
a. Locally Marketed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Sold to Nearest Villages	0	0	10	1	1	0	12	20.0
c. Sold to Gokwe/Sanyati	4	2	0	0	0	0	6	10.0
d. Sold to Private Dealers	2	1	0	0	5	7	15	25.0
e. Sold to Grain Marketing Board	4	1	0	0	0	0	5	8.3
f. Contract Secured for Sale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. No Answer/Invalid Answer	0	6	0	9	4	3	22	36.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
24) Marketing Practice - Maize								
a. Locally Marketed	1	1	0	1	0	0	3	5.0
b. Sold to Nearest Villages	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Sold to Gokwe/Sanyati	0	4	0	2	0	0	6	10.0
d. Sold to Private Dealers	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	6.7
e. Sold to Grain Marketing Board	2	1	6	5	0	0	14	23.3
f. Contract Secured for Sale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. No Answer/Invalid Answer	6	4	3	2	9	9	33	55.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
25) Marketing Practice - Groundnuts								
a. Locally Marketed	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	3.3
b. Sold to Nearest Villages	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Sold to Gokwe/Sanyati	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Sold to Private Dealers	1	6	3	6	1	0	17	28.3
e. Sold to Grain Marketing Board	1	0	3	0	0	0	4	6.7
f. Contract Secured for Sale	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. No Answer/Invalid Answer	7	4	4	4	8	10	37	61.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
26) Damages to Farming Area - Drought								
Average Damaged Area (ha)	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	4.2	7.0	2.9	-
a. Once in the Past	0	0	1	0	5	4	10	16.7
b. Occasionally	0	0	5	0	4	2	11	18.3
c. Regularly	0	0	2	0	0	2	4	6.7
d. None	10	10	2	10	1	2	35	58.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
27) Damages to Farming Area - Gully Erosion								
Average Damaged Area (ha)	2.0	2.3	2.8	3.1	0.0	0.0	1.7	-
a. Once in the Past	0	2	2	1	0	0	5	8.3
b. Occasionally	1	0	2	3	0	0	6	10.0
c. Regularly	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	5.0
d. None	9	6	5	6	10	10	46	76.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
28) Damages to Farming Area - Sheet Erosion								
Average Damaged Area (ha)	1.5	1.5	2.6	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	-
a. Once in the Past	2	6	2	5	0	0	15	25.0
b. Occasionally	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.7
c. Regularly	0	2	1	3	0	0	6	10.0
d. None	8	2	6	2	10	10	38	63.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
29) Average Annual Expenditure (Z\$/family)								
a. Food	26,301	14,020	17,400	30,460	14,160	12,114	19,076	46.1
b. Clothing	16,480	11,180	8,500	7,500	6,370	9,300	9,888	23.9
c. Education	5,953	1,161	1,372	2,140	2,237	3,650	2,752	6.7
d. Farming Input	1,747	1,536	2,494	3,036	931	1,361	1,851	4.5
e. Others	0	17,380	4,920	11,150	50	13,460	7,817	18.9
Total	50,481	45,277	34,686	54,286	23,748	39,825	41,384	100.0
3) Socio-economic Characteristics of Households								
1) Title Holder of Land								
a. Husband	7	8	5	6	8	8	42	70.0
b. Wife	3	1	5	1	1	2	13	21.7
c. Husband's Father	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.7
d. Husband's Mother	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.7
e. Wife's Father	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. Wife's Mother	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
g. Not Registered	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h. Unknown	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	5.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
2) Reliability of Water Resources-River								
a. Permanently Available	8	7	0	5	0	10	30	50.0
b. Seasonally Available	0	0	10	0	0	0	10	16.7
c. Timely Available/Maintained	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Available at Random	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Not Available	2	3	0	5	10	0	20	33.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
3) Reliability of Water Resources - Well								
a. Permanently Available	2	1	0	1	0	1	5	8.3
b. Seasonally Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Timely Available/Maintained	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.7
d. Available at Random	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Not Available	8	9	10	8	10	9	54	90.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0

Table 8 (26/29) Result of Household Survey

c. Study Area - C (continued)

Item	No. of Households						Average/ Total	%
	Gunde	Komboni	Mahvondo	Mateuro	Mujubeki	Mabharani		
4) Reliability of Water Resources - Borehole								
a. Permanently Available	4	4	0	1	1	1	11	18.3
b. Seasonally Available	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	6.7
c. Timely Available/Maintained	0	0	9	0	3	6	18	30.0
d. Available at Random	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.3
e. Not Available	6	6	0	5	5	3	25	41.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
5) Reliability of Water Resources - Others								
a. Permanently Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Seasonally Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Timely Available/Maintained	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Available at Random	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.7
e. Not Available	10	10	10	9	10	10	59	98.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
6) Use of Water Resources - River								
a. Drinking/Domestic Use	2	2	0	2	0	2	8	13.3
b. Fishing	3	3	2	4	0	0	12	20.0
c. Watering Crops	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Livestock	1	1	7	1	0	8	18	30.0
e. No Answer	4	4	1	3	10	0	22	36.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
7) Use of Water Resources - Well								
a. Drinking/Domestic Use	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Fishing	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	5.0
c. Watering Crops	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. No Answer	10	10	10	8	10	9	57	95.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
8) Use of Water Resources - Borehole								
a. Drinking/Domestic Use	5	4	9	3	10	7	38	63.3
b. Fishing	1	2	0	1	0	0	4	6.7
c. Watering Crops	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.7
d. Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. No Answer	4	4	1	5	0	3	17	28.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
9) Use of Water Resources - Others								
a. Drinking/Domestic Use	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.7
b. Fishing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Watering Crops	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Livestock	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. No Answer	10	10	10	9	10	10	59	98.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
10) Experiences of Supporting Services								
AGRITEX								
a. Every Year	1	4	9	6	9	9	38	63.3
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	0	2	0	2	1	0	5	8.3
c. Once in the Past 5 years	0	4	0	2	0	0	6	10.0
d. No Services Made Available	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. No Answer	9	0	1	0	0	1	11	18.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
11) Experiences of Supporting Services								
Veterinary Services								
a. Every Year	5	4	10	4	9	9	41	68.3
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7
c. Once in the Past 5 years	2	4	0	4	0	0	10	16.7
d. No Services Made Available	1	2	0	1	0	0	4	6.7
e. No Answer	1	0	0	1	1	1	4	6.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
12) Experiences of Supporting Services								
NGOs								
a. Every Year	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.3
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Once in the Past 5 years	0	0	8	0	0	0	8	13.3
d. No Services Made Available	0	0	0	4	1	0	5	8.3
e. No Answer	10	10	0	6	9	10	45	75.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
13) Experiences of Supporting Services								
Munyati Cooperative								
a. Every Year	0	0	10	0	0	0	10	16.7
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Once in the Past 5 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. No Services Made Available	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.7
e. No Answer	10	10	0	9	10	10	49	81.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
14) Experiences of Supporting Services								
Zunde Ramambo								
a. Every Year	0	0	10	3	0	0	13	21.7
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Once in the Past 5 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0

Table 8 (27/29) Result of Household Survey

c. Study Area - C (continued)

Item	No. of Households						Average/ Total	%
	Gunde	Komboni	Mahvondo	Mateuro	Mujibeki	Mabharani		
d. No Services Made Available	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.7
e. No Answer	10	10	0	6	10	10	46	76.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
15) Experiences of Supporting Services AFC and Its Loan Program								
a. Every Year	4	4	1	5	0	3	17	28.3
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Once in the Past 5 years	0	2	9	1	1	0	13	21.7
d. No Services Made Available	1	2	0	1	0	0	4	6.7
e. No Answer	5	2	0	3	9	7	26	43.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
16) Experiences of Supporting Services COTCO/COTPRO								
a. Every Year	9	8	9	9	8	7	50	83.3
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.7
c. Once in the Past 5 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. No Services Made Available	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	5.0
e. No Answer	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	10.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
17) Experiences of Supporting Services ZFU								
a. Every Year	5	4	2	5	1	1	18	30.0
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	5.0
c. Once in the Past 5 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. No Services Made Available	0	2	8	1	2	0	13	21.7
e. No Answer	5	2	0	3	7	9	26	43.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
18) Experiences of Supporting Services Others								
a. Every Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. 2-3 months in the Past 5 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Once in the Past 5 years	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. No Services Made Available	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	5.0
e. No Answer	10	8	10	9	10	10	57	95.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
19) Major Constraints Poor Road								
a. Very Severe	4	2	8	0	10	4	28	46.7
b. Severe	4	1	2	1	0	6	14	23.3
c. Not Severe	0	1	0	2	0	0	3	5.0
d. No Answer	2	6	0	7	0	0	15	25.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
20) Major Constraints Medical Care								
a. Very Severe	5	5	7	8	3	2	30	50.0
b. Severe	1	0	2	0	3	8	14	23.3
c. Not Severe	0	2	1	1	0	0	4	6.7
d. No Answer	4	3	0	1	4	0	12	20.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
21) Major Constraints Poor Bridge								
a. Very Severe	9	2	0	1	8	0	20	33.3
b. Severe	1	1	0	0	1	7	10	16.7
c. Not Severe	0	2	10	7	0	2	21	35.0
d. No Answer	0	5	0	2	1	1	9	15.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
22) Major Constraints Lack of Transportation for Marketing								
a. Very Severe	5	5	9	9	8	0	36	60.0
b. Severe	5	1	0	0	2	2	10	16.7
c. Not Severe	0	1	1	1	0	7	10	16.7
d. No Answer	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	6.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
23) Major Constraints Lack of Passenger Transportation								
a. Very Severe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Severe	0	5	0	9	0	0	14	23.3
c. Not Severe	2	0	9	0	0	8	19	31.7
d. No Answer	8	5	1	1	10	2	27	45.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
24) Major Constraints Water for Drinking/Domestic Use								
a. Very Severe	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	5.0
b. Severe	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	3.3
c. Not Severe	7	0	9	0	0	8	24	40.0
d. No Answer	0	10	0	10	10	1	31	51.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0

Table 8 (28/29) Result of Household Survey

c. Study Area - C (continued)

Item	No. of Households						Average/ Total	%
	Gunde	Komboni	Mahvondo	Mateuro	Mujubeki	Mabharani		
25) Major Constraints								
Water for Cropping/Gardening								
a. Very Severe	0	2	10	7	0	0	19	31.7
b. Severe	1	1	0	0	0	3	5	8.3
c. Not Severe	9	4	0	1	0	6	20	33.3
d. No Answer	0	3	0	2	10	1	16	26.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
26) Major Constraints								
Water for Livestock								
a. Very Severe	0	0	10	0	0	0	10	16.7
b. Severe	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	6.7
c. Not Severe	7	9	0	0	0	8	24	40.0
d. No Answer	0	1	0	10	10	1	22	36.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
27) Solution to Major Constraints								
Poor Road								
a. Gov. should provide the needs	1	1	0	1	2	1	6	10.0
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	6	2	10	2	8	9	37	61.7
c. Community should improve it	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Attract other services	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.0
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. No Answer	0	7	0	7	0	0	14	23.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
28) Solution to Major Constraints								
Medical Care								
a. Gov. should provide the needs	2	5	1	8	0	0	16	26.7
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	3	2	8	2	6	10	31	51.7
c. Community should improve it	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Attract other services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. No Answer	5	3	1	0	4	0	13	21.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
29) Solution to Major Constraints								
Poor Bridge								
a. Gov. should provide the needs	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	5.0
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	2	5	1	9	0	6	23	38.3
c. Community should improve it	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Attract other services	0	0	0	0	7	0	7	11.7
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. No Answer	8	5	9	0	2	3	27	45.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
30) Solution to Major Constraints								
Lack of Transportation for Marketing								
a. Gov. should provide the needs	0	5	2	8	9	0	24	40.0
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	2	2	3	1	0	2	10	16.7
c. Community should improve it	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Attract other services	0	0	4	0	1	0	5	8.3
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. No Answer	8	3	1	1	0	8	21	35.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
31) Solution to Major Constraints								
Lack of Passenger Transportation								
a. Gov. should provide the needs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	0	5	0	9	0	0	14	23.3
c. Community should improve it	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Attract other services	2	0	9	0	0	8	19	31.7
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f. No Answer	8	5	1	1	10	2	27	45.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
32) Solution to Major Constraints								
Water for Drinking/Domestic Use								
a. Gov. should provide the needs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	3.3
c. Community should improve it	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Attract other services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	0	0	1	0	9	0	10	16.7
f. No Answer	9	10	9	10	1	9	48	80.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
33) Solution to Major Constraints								
Water for Cropping/Gardening								
a. Gov. should provide the needs	0	2	0	7	0	0	9	15.0
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	0	3	0	3	0	0	6	10.0
c. Community should improve it	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Attract other services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	0	0	10	0	10	3	23	38.3
f. No Answer	10	5	0	0	0	7	22	36.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0

Table 8 (29/29) Result of Household Survey

c. Study Area - C (continued)

Item	No. of Households						Average/ Total	%
	Gunde	Komboni	Mahvondo	Mateuro	Mujubeki	Mabharani		
34) Solution to Major Constraints								
Water for Livestock								
a. Gov. should provide the needs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Gov. should improve the poor service	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	3.3
c. Community should improve it	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Attract other services	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Carry out the Pilot Project	0	0	10	0	10	1	21	35.0
f. No Answer	10	9	0	10	0	8	37	61.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
35) Benefit of Dam/Irrigation Project								
First Reason								
a. Fishing	6	9	9	9	9	0	42	70.0
b. Cropping and gardening	1	1	1	1	1	10	15	25.0
c. Livestock watering	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7
d. Water for industrial use	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. No answer	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
35) Benefit of Dam/Irrigation Project								
Second Reason								
a. Fishing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
b. Cropping and gardening	4	8	9	8	10	10	49	81.7
c. Livestock watering	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Water for industrial use	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. No answer	6	2	1	2	0	0	11	18.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
35) Benefit of Dam/Irrigation Project								
Third Reason								
a. Fishing	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.7
b. Cropping and gardening	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Livestock watering	3	7	7	6	3	10	36	60.0
d. Water for industrial use	0	0	1	1	7	0	9	15.0
e. No answer	7	3	1	3	0	0	14	23.3
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
36) Effect of the Dam/Irrigation Project								
a. No effect	6	8	10	8	10	3	45	75.0
b. Create more works	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. No Answer	4	2	0	2	0	7	15	25.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
37) Willingness to Relocation								
a. Not willing to move	4	8	10	8	10	10	50	83.3
b. Willing to move	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. No Answer	6	2	0	2	0	0	10	16.7
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0
38) Conditions of Relocation								
a. Compensation for resettlement	5	8	7	7	10	10	47	78.3
b. Social responsibility	0	1	2	1	0	0	4	6.7
c. Fear of floods and crocodiles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d. Aware of the Project's benefit	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.3
e. Self/cultural reasons	5	1	0	1	0	0	7	11.7
c. No Answer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	10	10	10	10	10	10	60	100.0